THE

CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CXVI.] AUGUST, 1854. [Vol. X.

BIBLICAL SCIENCE.*

The movement and change which have pre-eminently distinguished the last half century, appear in no department of human inquiry with more marked results than in historical and critical theology. It is true that this is a science which dates back early in the annals of the Christian church, and has traces, though the remotest are somewhat faint, in facts and traditions connected with the Hebrew religion, while yet it bloomed on its native soil. An historical religion, such as is the religion of Moses and the religion of Jesus, must have records, and records, with an intelligent people, necessitate criticism. It is not denied that the religion of Hindostan and the religion of China have records without criticism, but they are also connected with a civilization without progress. Of such a social condition, veneration is the predominant power, and it is the characteristic of veneration to foster and preserve rather than to investigate and improve. Intellectual activity, however, scrutinizes before it accepts, and retains only what it has seen good reason to sanction. The exclusive or even the undue exercise of such a power may be destructive, by disowning unsound or questionable claims. But the prevalence of a blind veneration is still more injurious in relation to the past; for as by its warm and sultry mists it confounds all lines of distinction, it precludes the possibility of discrimination, and so leaves the true to share the lot of the false, when a critical eye comes to survey the confused accumulations. Such is the condition in which appear the sacred books of the East before the tribunal of modern scholarship. What their age,

* Biblisches Realwörterbuch zum Handgebrauch fur Studirende, Candidaten, &c. Ausgearbeitet von Dr. Georg Benedict Winer. 2 vols. 8vo. Third Edition. Leipsic. 1847.

Handbuch der Theologischen Literatur. Von Dr. Georg B. Winer. 1 vol. (with a Supplement) 8vo. Third Edition. Leipsic. 1838.

Thesaurus Librorum Rei Catholicæ. 2 vols. 8vo. Würzburg. 1848.

The Bible of every Land: a History of the Sacred Scriptures in every Language and Dialect into which Translations have been made. Illustrated with Specimen Portions in Native Characters, Series of Alphabets, Coloured Ethnographical Maps, &c. 1 vol. 4to. London—Samuel Bagster and Sons. 1848.

The Life and Letters of Saint Paul. By the Rev. W. J. Conybeare, M.A., and the Rev. J. S. Howson, M.A. 2 vols. 4to. London—Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans. 1853.

who their authors, what in them is historically true and what false, are questions which now are beyond the hope of any satisfactory answer. There is one exception, and but one. The Hebrew Scriptures and the Christian Scriptures are historical, and have and ever will retain an historical value. The difference, under Divine Providence, is owing to the prevalence in the Hebrew and the Christian church of a certain historical criticism. The heats of the further East dissolved mental energy into the haze of purblind veneration. The revealed energy of God's own intelligence in Palestine, set intellectual power side by side with veneration, and made prophets and priests careful and scrupulous as to what objects they placed in the ark divinely appointed to keep and transmit the most precious tokens of God's presence and favour to distant generations. Thus Hebrew tradition was no less discriminative than conservative; and this wise mixture of the two essential elements of historical truth passed from the Jewish into the Christian church. It is not, indeed, to be denied that, with the increasing degeneracy of later ages, the discrimination in the earlier church became less and less, so as in "the last days," the days of the Messiah, to have lost nearly all its peculiar features. The obliteration, however, was the less to be regretted, because, while it had left the treasures of the ark untouched, however overlaid with human conceits, it was about to be followed by the dawn of a new era, an era of great intellectual activity, an era of new light, an era which could not fail to "try every man's work" (1 Cor. iii. 15). Nor can it be asserted that, after Christianity had taken its seat by the side of the Cæsars, a period of credulity did not supervene, in the prevailing darkness of which the boundary lines of the genuine and the spurious, the historical and the legendary, were concealed or at least partially effaced. But that death was also followed by a new life, in the midst of whose products we stand, seeing with our own eyes that only the incorrupt and the vigorous have borne permanent fruit.

If we may believe the Jewish doctors, a critical spirit developed itself contemporaneously with the creative spirit of inspiration, so that the comment and the text, the record and the supplementary tradition, were produced in the same age. The notion, however, that rabbinism sprang up at the very side of Moses, is not only destitute of historical support, but is contradicted by analogy; yet does it present the impression of the Hebrew people attesting the early existence and operation of a critical spirit as applied to their sacred books. That impression is brought out into a reality by several unquestionable facts. What are the division and the arrangement of the contents of the Old Testament but the work of art either on the part of the authors or the conservators of the books, most likely on the part of both? What is the relation which the later books bear to the

earlier—for instance, Chronicles to the Pentateuch—but a critical relation,—a relation which abridges and expands and comments and adapts and applies? The very preservation of certain writings in a literature richer than any other of the same age, evidences the exercise of selection, and selection, as involving a ground of preference, is a process of critical art. And then that selection, as we know by its results, is so grounded and so guided as to form and transmit a whole class of books perfectly homogeneous, having in substance one aim, one spirit, one doctrine, and pursuing that unity of intellectual and moral life through many successive generations, and over very diversified social conditions. Whence this? Ascribe it to the superintending control of the Governor of the world. But Providence works by human instruments. The human power was a spirit of criticism. The same power is seen in the kerib and ketib, the *read* and the *written*, or what modern criticism calls the *various readings* of the Hebrew manuscripts. It is seen also in the whole of the Talmudical writings, with their different authors, their opposing schools, their various principles, their numerous emendations and multiplied and multiform expositions of the sacred text. And when the multifarious mass of writings produced in the first and the second century of our era came before the tribunal of the Christian church, ere two hundred years had elapsed from the resurrection of its Head, what but a critical process was that which led to the successful discrimination of the apostolic from the heretical, the genuine from the spurious, books that were universally received from books of partial and limited prevalence,—and which finally settled the canon on grounds so satisfactory and by tokens so indisputable, that posterity has had little else to do than to approve and ratify the decision? Nor let it be supposed that this critical process was carried through without the salutary checks of vigilant eyes and opposing lips. The catholicity of the church was confronted by the heresy of the sects, and the true canon of apostolical authorship had rivals and competitors in the false canons of self-interested forgery. There ensued collisions,—nay, a long and bitter warfare,—in which discussion must have been favourable to truth, and toward which the criticism of the day doubtless lent its best assistance. The first express declaration and testimony of this critical process conducted by the church, is found in the remnants of the writings of Origen (born at Alexandria in 185 A.D.), who, while he recorded its existence, did his part to make the process more exact, and who tells us of a division of the Christian writings current in his day into three classes, the genuine (*γνήσια*), the spurious (*νόθα*), and the doubtful (*μικτά*), shewing the precision with which the unobtrusive and perhaps half-unconscious criticism of that primitive age, distinguished between the word of God and the traditions of men. The voice of the church found a still more full and emphatic, if

a somewhat less critical utterance in the ecclesiastical historian Eusebius* (born in Palestine about 264 A.D.), who, dividing existing Christian writings into three classes, produced, first, those which he calls *admitted* (βιβλία ὁμολογούμενα), and describes also by these epithets, namely, *stored up* (ενδιάθηκα), *undisputed* (αναμφίλεκτα), *unopposed* (ἀναντίῤῥητα), the *genuine* of Origen; second, those which he characterizes as *spoken against* or doubtful (ἀντιλεγόμενα), and of which he says that they were generally known and were publicly read in most churches. The third class consisted of writings which were circulated by the heretics under the sanction of the name of the apostles, and which our authority speaks of as *altogether spurious and divergent from the apostolic type of doctrine* (παντελῶς νόθα καὶ τῆς αποστολικῆς ὀρθοδοξίας ἀλλότρια). Even in that early period, the two lines of evidence, the external and the internal, which modern criticism has recognized and applied no less to the classical writings than to the biblical, had been developed and were in use; by the external, the deliberate judgment of the church, as known and exhibited in the established usages of its separate assemblies, as well as the practice of its distinguished individuals, was ascertained, declared, confirmed and perpetuated; and in the internal lay the solemn decision of the Christian mind and the Christian affection which, to some extent guided by recollection and tradition, and chiefly guided by its own deep sense of spiritual congruity, judged and determined whether a writing was or was not of apostolic origin and authority, from that *regula veritatis*, test or canon (Gal. vi. 16, *rule*), of evangelical doctrine which the disciples had in their own thoughts and their own experience. The critical proceedings of Eusebius and Origen may not have been conformed to all the requirements of our modern science; it is enough for our purpose to shew that the books of the New Testament were not thrown together by chance or caprice, but that the canon was formed under the deliberate employment of principles unquestionable in their validity at all times, though now greatly improved in their application. While a critical spirit was never absent from the ancient Hebrew and Christian church, it displayed itself in a more decided manner in two separate eras. In the ancient Christian church, the specially critical era was that of Origen and Eusebius, to which reference has just been made. In the ancient Jewish church, the specially critical era was that of the scribe Ezra, who not only deliberately recognized and sanctioned the genuine old Hebrew literature, but also transferred it from the ancient Samaritan character into the then modern Chaldee, and expounded the Law and the Prophets of the olden time in thoughts and diction readily appreciable by the most unlearned of his contemporaries (Nehemiah viii.). Both eras

* Ecclesiast. Hist. iii. 3, 31, 39, especially 25; compare vi. 13.

have the recommendation of being the natural result of foregoing providential circumstances. Ezra's criticism was required by the obliterations and novelties of the Babylonish captivity. The criticism of Origen and Eusebius was required by the rank growth of tares among the rich growth of wheat, occasioned by the quickening life of Christ.

Again and again, in the lapse of ages, have these two sacred literatures given birth to schools of criticism. It may suffice to mention two instances,—the latter the inevitable consequence of the former. The activity of intellect which in part caused, and in part was produced by, the period which we call the revival of letters, brought forth from libraries and monasteries, where they had lain for ages, not only the precious writings of the classic authors, but the far more precious writings of the inspired servants and messengers of God. As one after the other of these pearls of great price came out of darkness into light, the question arose, "Whose work is this?" and the agitation and settlement of that oft-repeated inquiry gave birth to a classical and a sacred criticism, which led, for the most part, to positive results of the most definite character. This era of critical activity was, as is usual with all sublunary movements, succeeded by a time of uncritical acquiescence, during which the schools were for the most part satisfied with repeating the dicta of their several churches. But this passive subjection of mind could not endure in a church, the essential conditions of whose existence are light and activity. A new era of biblical criticism consequently began to dawn in the middle of the last century, which, rising to its zenith in the early part of the present century, has shone steadily on with undiminished lustre to almost the present hour.

The chief cause of this revival of biblical criticism may be found in a great anti-christian movement, which, extending throughout Europe, or rather throughout the civilized world, has, though latterly with much abated influence, come down to these times. The movement had its origin in our own country on the part of those who, in literary history, are known as "the English Deists." Imbued with the spirit of a philosophy which made the senses the sole inlets to knowledge, and erected the understanding into the umpire of truth, Lord Edward Herbert of Cherbury, who died in 1648, Blount, Toland, Collins, Woolston, Mandeville, Tindal, Morgan and others, assailed the Bible on dogmatical grounds, objecting to its prophecies, its miracles and its doctrines, which they found opposed to their system of mere naturalism, and of which they were desirous of destroying the authority, in order to undermine the national church, and generally to annihilate the influence of the Christian ministry. While, however, the long-continued and repeated assaults of English Deism had for its point of support the assumed incredibility of the biblical records, it did not fail to impugn the au-

thority of the writings in which the obnoxious statements and doctrines were contained. Thus, while Spinoza had gone the length of declaring that the books of the Old Testament were forged in the time of Ezra, Toland, in his Amyntor (1699), pronounced the New Testament spurious, on the ground that the original autographs could not be produced, that the authors were unknown, and that the text was uncertain. The advancement of positions such as these, was to lay the axe at the foot of the tree.

The whole movement was superficial. Those by whom it was originated and sustained, had little acquaintance with either Hebrew or Christian antiquity, and as little were they versed in sacred or profane philology. Embittered against the clergy, they seized such weapons as came to hand; and when none offered themselves, fabricated weapons out of their own imaginations, aiming only to demolish the ancient edifice of Christianity, which was odious in their eyes. On motives such as these, no other seal can be set than the seal of stern disapprobation; and from efforts of this description, the direct gain to truth must have been of the smallest extent. Superficial, however, as the movement was, it produced deep and widely-extended results. If the assailants were but partially informed, and had for the most part scarcely any pretensions to learning, the persons whom they addressed, and whom they wished to sway, were in general little less than ignorant on the points put at issue, if only from the fact that the English people, even in the educated classes, have never gone below the surface in matters of divinity, and, down to the present, prefer the guidance of what they call "common sense" to the science of criticism, the philosophy of history, or to any abstractions whatever. In consequence, even their clerical guides were by no means equipped so as to give the most effectual answer to the naturalists of the day. A becoming zeal and respectable scholarship were displayed in the controversy with the new Deism by some divines; but, for the most part, the great questions and principles on which the settlement of the dispute in reality depended, remained equally untouched and unknown. English superficiality, in its hostile bearing against the sacred Scriptures, was eagerly seized by French frivolity. Diderot, Dalembert, Voltaire and Rousseau, exaggerating the extravagance and intensifying the bitterness of their English masters, combined in various writings, and specially in the notorious "Encyclopedia" and the "Philosophical Dictionary," to make on the biblical writings, as well as on the then existing forms of Christianity, the most unsparing, the most intemperate and the most scornful attack that the gospel ever underwent. In France, as in England, the assault was directed chiefly against the contents of the Bible; but the book itself was, as a book, pronounced to be of a merely human origin, having no claim to

respect beyond that which imagination might ascribe to the spurious Orations of Cicero or the supposititious Letters of Phalaris.*

This attack made by the united forces of Gallic Deism and Atheism was, no less than the previous one from which it sprang, dictated and sustained by hatred rather than knowledge. Never, perhaps, in the whole history of controversy, was a more truculent spirit manifested than appears in the anti-christian writings of that prince of superficialities, Voltaire.† Yet, alas! the appetite of the public corresponded to the tendered offal, and the French mind fed greedily, and still feeds, on patent falsities under the mask of important and renovating truths. Eminently unfit was the whole school of Gallic philosophers to estimate, and by estimating to gain a right to criticize, the Bible. Of Eastern history and Eastern manners and customs, Voltaire and his associates were utterly ignorant; they possessed scarcely a smattering of the requisite knowledge, and of the requisite taste they were entirely destitute. In their silly attempt, therefore, they made ridiculous blunders, and have left to all who are more ready to question than to inquire, warnings which even self-love ought to make effectual.

The contest took a much more serious aspect when transferred to the earnest minds and learned schools of Germany. Losing at once its English superficiality and its French frivolity, the hostile spirit went down into the depth of things, and opened the whole question of the origin and credibility of the sacred books of the Jewish and the Christian Church. The affair became the more serious from the fact that, under the guises of a varying Rationalism, which not seldom ran in the merest Naturalism, the enemy took his seat in the citadel of the churches, and made his attacks in the prelections of the professor's chair or the expositions of critical exegesis. An age of wild disorganization ensued. Every point was assailed,—every point, in the opinion of the assailant, was carried. The frame and the portrait, the image and the niche, the saint and the shrine, were smashed together, so far as they were made of breakable materials, as if by the hard hand of a theological Cromwell. A cry of surprise, and then a

---

* Diderot, *Pensées Philosophiques*, 1746, sect. 60; De la Serre, *La Vraie Religion*, 1767, p. 37. See on the subject a valuable work which traces the historical genesis of the whole, in Lechler's *Geschichte des Engl. Deismus*, 1841. The survey of the controversy given in Leland's *View of the Principal Deistical Writers in England* (London, 1754), though the only work on the point, is now at least found insufficient and unsatisfactory by all competent judges, if considered as offering an answer to the objections which it historically sets forth. The most effectual confutation and exposure there is in English, may be found in Priestley's *Letters to a Philosophical Unbeliever*, Vols. XVI. XVII., Rutt's edition.

† The most violent attack was made by Damilaville's (commonly thought to be Holbach's) *Le Christianisme Devoilé, ou Examen des Principes et des Effets de la Religion Chrétienne* (Nancy, 1767), published in London under the title of *Christianity Unveiled*, and under the name of Boulanger.

cry of alarm, and finally a cry of distress, went up from the camp of the Lord, and the world was well-nigh believing that it was all over no less with Christianity than the Church.* The career of Rationalism in Germany was stopped by that which seemed at first likely to give it a new impulse and an irresistible momentum. Strauss, in his *Leben Jesu*, put forth his mythical theory, and Rationalism was dissolved in his mists.† From that moment the battle became a contest between the religion of the gospel and no religion, between the abstractions of Hegelianism shamming Orthodoxy and the deep faith of the Christian heart, rendered all the more precious and the dearer from the infidelities to which it had been exposed. This practical Atheism has its critical side in the school of Tübingen theology, whose heresiarch, Baur, still labours to destroy the authority of the Christian canon; and, while he snatches out of Paul's hands all his Epistles save four, not only spares no effort to bring down the composition of John's Gospel nearly a hundred years after its reputed date, but exercises a perverse ingenuity, whose purpose is to find the true source of Christianity itself—its blessed truths, as well as its sacred writings and its divine effects—in the ordinary affections, powers and impulses of human nature.

While Rationalism was making its devastating way on the continent, nurtured by philosophy and propagated by divines, a vulgar and gross scepticism had been dereligionizing the lower orders in England. The earliest and perhaps, on the whole, the most revolting herald of this darkness, miscalled light, was Thomas Paine, born, in 1737, at Thetford, in Norfolk, whose "Age of Reason" charged the Bible with nonsense, falsehood and forgery. As far as the information of the day permitted, he was well answered by Watson, Bishop of Llandaff, Gilbert Wakefield and others. His writings, however, though of the most superficial and loosest kind, called forth and encouraged, in the unreflecting and uninformed, a love of theological disputation and a proneness to doubt and denial which, especially as they were recommended by republican views in politics, deeply infected the popular mind

---

* Consult Schlosser, *Geschichte des 18ten Jahrhunderts*, the section on Literature in the first and second volume.

Villemain, *Cours de Litterature Française; Tableau du dix-huitième Siècle;* Première Partie, Paris, 1838.

A Critical History of Rationalism in Germany, by Amand Saintes, translated by the Author of the People's Dictionary of the Bible; London, Simpkin, Marshall and Co., 1849. Saintes' French original was translated into German, with considerable additions, by Ficker (Leipzig, 1847); and this German version is now the most complete work and the best authority on the subject.

Beitrag zu Geschichte und Lit. aus der Schätzen der Wolfenbüttel Bibliothek, herausg. von G. E. Lessing; Brunswick, 1778.

Th. Venturini, *Natürliche Geschichte des Grossen Propheten von Nazareth;* Copenhagen, 1800-2.

† Consult *The Voices of the Church in Reply to Dr. D. F. Strauss*, by the Rev. J. R. Beard, D.D.; London, Simpkin, Marshall and Co., 1845.

with scepticism, the effects of which have not yet wholly passed away. About the end of the first quarter of this century, Paine was followed by Carlile, an upstart tinker, and Taylor, a renegade priest, who became the missionaries in England of a system of infidelity which aimed to sweep away the Christian religion altogether. Carlile, with no learning and little knowledge, was compelled to depend on a certain skill in disputation and facility of speech. Taylor, "the Devil's Chaplain," as he was called, was at once more degraded and better informed than his associate; but whatever acquaintance he had with Christian antiquity, he did not scruple, *per fas et nefas*, to forge therefrom a weapon against the books and the doctrines of the gospel. Proceeding a step beyond that which men of any position in the learned world would have ventured to take up, these champions of negations in religion and republicanism in social life, boldly denied even the existence of Jesus Christ, and found only too much favour in a population left for the most part without sound instruction in either the history or the teachings of Christianity.* In England, unbelief has generally been mixed up with social or political sympathies and schemes. Such was the alliance which it had in the advocacy of the well-known visionary, Robert Owen,† the hedges of whose social parallelograms were to be planted in a soil out of which religion was altogether rooted up. Taking up their positions in the ignorant and excitable masses of our large towns, the representatives of this atheistic socialism seemed for a time likely to prevail; but as they enticed the young from their fire-sides to join in public dancing, as they assailed the sanctity and loosened the bands of wedlock, and as some of them mixed even buffoonery with irreligion, and hypocritically assailed the gospel while pretending to expound it, Owen and his band were made to feel, by decreasing audiences and increasing debts, that, much as the English public will welcome licence of speech, they will not encourage, nay, nor endure, the desecration of their domestic sanctities and the violation of the religion of their hearths. The comparative failure of this set and deliberate attempt to infidelize the English people, has checked the propagandism of unbelief, and, leaving men's minds time to reflect and settle down, has, under due efforts on the part of the ministers of religion, and specially the indirect influence of Sunday-school discipline, occasioned a general return to a sounder state of feeling, so that at the present there is, on the whole, little popular infidelity prevalent, and accordingly, Holyoake and other advocates have a severe struggle to find the means of subsistence.

Meanwhile, there has been growing up in the midst of us, in

* Their assaults were met and repelled in *The Historical Evidences of Christianity Unassailable*, by John R. Beard, 1826.

† See *Lectures on Owenism*, by John R. Beard.

the higher and cultivated ranks, a species of spiritualistic eclecticism which finds good almost everywhere except in the Bible, and acknowledges a sort of universal religion, provided always it does not include the revelation which God made by his Son Jesus the Christ. The hierophant of this school is Francis William Newman, formerly Fellow of Baliol College, Oxford. His efforts to destroy Christianity as an historical and revealed religion, have had coadjutors in Foxton, Greg and others, and there is reason to fear have served to unsettle the minds, if not to destroy the faith, of many whom a vulgar infidelity could not reach. The best answer, and, in the judgment of the writer, it is an effectual one,—the best answer that has been put forth to the objections of this new school of unbelief, is a work by Edward Miall, editor of the "Nonconformist" newspaper, and Member of Parliament for the borough of Rochdale.* This clear, forcible and sometimes eloquent writer, well furnished with the requisite knowledge and thoroughly versed in the questions at issue, takes objectors on their own grounds, and, from that earthly point of view whence they draw their principles and their arguments, shews demonstratively that the old and now assailed methods of Christian defence have not, as was triumphantly alleged, become invalid and untrustworthy, but remain sound and proof against all attack, capable of leading sincere and unprejudiced men to a firm and vital faith in the person, the life and the teachings of Jesus, the Saviour of the world.

In God's providence, evil is often seen to lead to good. The attacks of unbelief have had the undesigned effect of placing Christianity on a broader and a yet more stable basis. This happy result has been brought about chiefly by the correction and improvement of the processes of theological inquiry and instruction. Assailed in of course the weak points of their system, theologians have felt it necessary to abandon what they could not defend, to remove what was unsound, to strengthen what was weak, and in all and before all, to scrutinize every fact, to weigh every position, to trace the bearing of every principle, and to present the whole in a well-digested and systematic form, so that each part might give as well as receive support, and the whole come on the mind with its full momentum and unimpaired effect. In other words, theology has more and more within the last century been assuming the character of a science. Such a result is, before all things, most desirable, and chiefly for the promotion of that result has this essay been composed.

We have prefixed to the essay the title, "Biblical Science." Before proceeding further, we wish to explain what we thereby mean. Science is a systematic exposition of well-defined and carefully-ascertained phenomena; and biblical science is such an

* Bases of Belief, an Examination of Christianity as a Divine Revelation by the Light of Recognized Facts and Principles, 1 vol. 8vo; London, 1853.

exposition so far as relates to the Bible. Viewed in its remoter and in its ultimate relations, biblical science might embrace religious opinions and religious institutions, and so comprise our creeds and our churches. But while such an extension of the terms would in itself be scarcely justifiable, we think it best, on many grounds, to restrict the application to the sacred Scriptures, considered generally in their origin and their contents, as a repository of facts to be admitted or rejected, rather than as a source of doctrines to be believed and of spiritual life to be appropriated. We know well that it is the latter which chiefly gives their value to the former; but there is, we think, an advantage in studying the former apart from the latter, if only in the obvious probability that thereby the former may be more exactly known, more precisely expounded and more securely established. We refer to the instance of the distinction at length securely established in physical studies, namely, that which separates abstract science from applied science. From that distinction, what advantages have ensued! Until that distinction was recognized and in a measure observed, physical science scarcely had an existence. In proportion as it has been rigidly followed, both the abstract sciences and the applied sciences have made progress, until now the former present a system of formulæ the most definite and the most comprehensive, and the latter a system of phenomena the most clear and the most certain; while the mental discipline afforded by the study of the abstract sciences, and the practical uses to which the applied sciences are turned, combine to confer on our race blessings of the highest and the most durable nature. So long, however, as the two were confounded together, and use and opinion not only pre-judged and pre-determined facts, but prevailed so far as even to form laws, mould systems, nay, construct a universe, science neither did nor in any way could advance; and its surface, which ought to mirror only the mind of God as shewn in his works, did little else than reflect the imperfect, the distorted, the broken, the dim images of the mind of man. What science was before the distinction was practically made, is seen in the writings of Plato, Aristotle and the schoolmen. What science now is, may be known, and what it will be under the influence of that distinction, may be concluded from the writings of Bacon, and Newton, and La Place, and Dalton, and Liebig.

It is then with abstract Biblical Science that we have here to do. Strictly speaking, abstract science is the only science. Science is knowledge, and knowledge is an acquaintance with facts as they are,—simple facts, uncoloured facts, facts neither lessened nor magnified, facts as presented to and by the intellect, wholly apart from the shadows and the lights, the breadths and the depths, of our emotional nature. This is science in its materials; and these materials, when marked and classified and ar-

ranged according to certain inherent and essential features, form science in the full and highest sense of the term. Such is the science which we wish to see cultivated in relation to the Bible.

But here we must remove an objection. So pure an abstraction as is this science cannot minister to religion; how can there be a religious influence in that out of which the charities and sympathies of our nature are avowedly and expressly shut? The objection is founded on a mistake of our aim. That aim is to secure the hill of Zion, not to inhabit and enjoy it. The enemy declares that Christianity is not what it is said to be. The first question then is, What is Christianity? true or false? a human invention or a revelation from God? That question cannot be answered until we have a satisfactory reply to another—What is the Bible? what is its age? its contents? its claims? its rights? Here again the issue—true or false? reliable or unreliable?—comes first into view, and cannot be dismissed until a satisfactory answer be gained. Nay, independently of any hostility whatever, every man is of all things most concerned to know the exact facts in this issue, than which none can be so momentous,—the issue, we mean, set before us by the Bible. Here is a Messenger who declares he is sent from God in order to offer forgiveness of our sins and life everlasting. What can be so important as to examine his credentials and ascertain his real character? At any rate, must not this precede every other step? And if this, the first step, is not safely made, can any after step be sure? The first step, we know, is not religion. Neither is a knowledge of the alphabet familiarity with literature, yet a familiarity with literature cannot be had apart from a knowledge of the alphabet. Science is not religion; even biblical science is not religion; but science may be the handmaid of religion, and biblical science, if it only places its cultivators in the court of the Gentiles, any way brings them very near the temple of the living God. It is possible, indeed, that even biblical science should be connected with an unbelieving or even an ungodly heart. Divine truth itself may be held in unrighteousness (Rom. i. 18). What then? Divine truth, if thereby disserved, is not thereby disparaged. Holiness must be cultivated for its own sake and on its own grounds. We speak not against the cultivation of holiness when we try to enforce the cultivation of biblical science. The use of one good thing does not exclude the use of another good thing. Science and holiness may be, nay, ought to be, pursued at the same time. But then let them be separately pursued. Each has its own work. Each has its own processes. Each has its own bases and its own results. Why confound the one with the other? Why deny the prerogatives of either? Why not pay loyal homage to both? They are not jealous sovereigns, but friendly and allied states; by serving the one, you in effect serve and honour the other.

Biblical science, then, is the science of the Bible; that is, an exact, comprehensive and systematic acquaintance of what the Bible is in itself and in its history. The science of the Bible differs from religion, because religion is a soul quickened into spiritual life under the aid of the Bible; whereas the Bible itself is but a record, and biblical science is a knowledge of that record. And the science of the Bible differs from theology, inasmuch as theology is the science of God,—that is, the science of God's revealed will; but the Bible is but the record of that will, and biblical science is a knowledge of that record. Biblical science, accordingly, embraces everything relating to the origin, the substance, the credibility of the biblical record. Advancing as far as the acceptance of the book, at that point it comes to a stand. And this it does, not arbitrarily, but on necessity. Up to that point it deals with facts; beyond that point it would enter the domain of opinions. Even with the credibility of the Bible it has to do only as with a conclusion, for its business is not to vindicate so much as to describe the Bible. Should the correct description of the Bible prove its vindication—as we do not doubt it will do and must do—that result is of God's ordination, and is to be taken simply as an inevitable result,—a result neither hindered nor sought for,—a pure intellectual conclusion ensuing from, or rather involved in, the premises.

The science of which we speak is evidently an historical science. Here is a book whose history we wish to trace from its rudimental to its fully completed form. We wish to ascertain who were its authors, when they lived, what opportunities they had for knowing what they state, through what vicissitudes the several parts and the united whole has passed, and by what means and in what condition the book has come down into our own hands. This totality constitutes what we mean by "biblical science."

The description suffices to justify the separate treatment of biblical science. The Bible is a cyclopedia. The Bible is the whole literature of one tongue, and part of the literature of another tongue. As a cyclopedia and a literature, the Bible demands, as a preliminary to the successful study of it, a minute and personal acquaintance with the whole circle of science, ancient and modern. If you would know the Bible well and truly, you must be familiar with Hebrew and Greek and their cognate languages; you must be minutely conversant with ancient history in all its branches, especially the oriental; you must have studied the religions and the superstitions of the world, in order to assign to the biblical religion its proper place, and estimate it at its due worth; you must possess a thorough acquaintance with literature and literary history, so as to be able to compare these sacred books with the sacred books of other nations, and to trace the pathway by which the biblical writings have come down to our own age, in manuscript and in print, and to determine how far

their condition at any moment of past time or at the present moment, is such as is in itself satisfactory, and is also congruent with the actual circumstances as they were then or as they are now; you must have made yourself master of at least the sciences of which the rudiments were known to the ancient world, otherwise you will be totally at a loss to form a fair and correct estimate of very many of the biblical statements and implications; and—to go no farther—you need also a mind, not only capacious enough to receive and contain all these things, but cultivated enough to bring them into order, and disciplined and powerful enough to wield the whole and every part in such a way as circumstances may require, and to such a result as may enable you finally to pronounce thereon a wise and equitable judgment, not merely for your own guidance, but also for the guidance of others.

It is an unhappy thing that, especially in theology, German scholarship has still to plead for admission into our high places of knowledge. Yet to the previously mentioned qualifications of a theologian, we must be permitted to add a critical acquaintance with the masterpieces of German learning. Those writings are models of the scientific treatment of questions which it most concerns the divine to be acquainted with. But on this point we must arrest our pen. Let the requirements we have ventured to claim be duly considered, and then let it be determined whether the study of divinity is not an office, not only sufficient for a man or for a class of men, but of necessity demanding on the part of some the exclusive devotion of the best energies of a whole life. Like astronomy or geology or chemistry, biblical science must have its own special cultivators, so that it may have also its own independent circle of truths and principles, whence the men of practice—the priests of the sanctuary and those who minister from house to house—may, with good conscience and entire security, dispense the word of life, which is the word of God. Is it replied that already they can perform the work? Yes, most safely and most liberally, if they are well read in the classical works or in the recognized results of German theology, which are pervaded by a scientific spirit, and present the sure and durable gains of scientific treatment. But scarcely otherwise; for the knowledge is spreading that unbelief boasts of many a triumph in its recent attacks on revealed religion. That knowledge is followed by a sense of insecurity on one side, and a readiness, not to say hardihood, of denial on another, the combined operation of which must make the pastor tread with an unsteady foot, and sometimes, at least, take from his words their due efficacy. But officials whose duty it is to guard the palladium of divine truth, and those who are appointed to carry salvation to perishing myriads, may be expected to own the sway of higher motives than those which spring from danger or are prompted by fear. The simple state of the case is this—that

within the last century the whole cause of the Bible, in its own essential qualities and in its relation to human science and human culture, has been pleaded afresh; issues have been joined on a multitude of minor questions involved in the great question, and judgment has been given and recorded. Can any professed expounder of the Bible be guiltless, if, knowing this fact, he make no inquisition after the result? In other terms—under the various and very valuable aids of modern scholarship, modern research, and modern exploration and discovery, almost every biblical question has been studied over again, has been subjected to a fresh investigation, and a minuter as well as more intelligent and more rigorous scrutiny. Of the multitudinous questions thus passed under review, scarcely is there one that has not undergone modification. In some, old opinions have been confirmed —in others, old opinions have been confuted; here, a slight change has been made—there, a great change. In general, the issue is highly satisfactory; but in particular cases the result is various. Who but the careful student can be sure that he is not positive where he should be cautious, and that he does not yield to timidity where he would be justified in the utmost confidence? Any way, is not the love of truth for truth's sake a sufficient inducement to survey the labours of others, in the pleasing hope and the manly resolve to gain more light, to learn to know things as they are, to honour God by honouring truth, which is at once God's essence and God's word? Few impulses are there in the human breast more noble or more elevating than a simple and ardent love of truth, apart from all consequences and independent of all reward. As there are few, if any, nobler impulses, so is the social power which so lofty a passion exerts of the most beneficent nature. Great and good as are the truths which result from such an aim, and prove the immediate recompence of its exercise, even these are inferior to the pure, high and manly spirit with which it impregnates the mind of a nation, making that nation's life a grand thing in itself, and capable of grand and undying actions. Indeed, the love of truth in simplicity and earnestness approximates man to God, the Author of truth, and gives him the mind of Christ, the promulgator aud the martyr of truth. Who does not admire this divine spirit in our astronomers, our chemists, our geologists, our historians? How long, O Lord, how long shall not the very ministers of truth lead the van of the army of the living God, which goes forth to make new conquests and acquire new territories in the boundless domain of truth?

Biblical science, then, implies two qualities,—first, a sincere and earnest love of biblical truth; and, secondly, with a view to the free existence and energetic action of that love of truth, the absence of all foregone conclusions, all predilections for, and all aversion to, any particular form of opinion or result, and a careful

and constant abstaining from theories and *à-priori* reasonings. There is the positive quality—the simple, earnest, constant and all-absorbing love of truth. This passion is an ardent desire and firm determination to discover actual phenomena, to recognize and record actual phenomena, as they present themselves, in their own rigid accuracy, and under the conditions existing in each case; and it is a manly resolve and a scrupulous care to report those phenomena, and, in argument or in narrative or in system-building, to use those phenomena with the utmost good faith, precisely in the state in which they first appeared to the mind, so as to make each fact and the combined whole stand before the eye of man as nearly as may be in the same shape and the same light as they stand in before the eye of God.

But the presence in all its fulness of this positive quality, requires the absence of certain influences of a very subtle and very perverting nature. We do not approach the study of the Bible with unoccupied or unbiassed minds. We bring to it all the loved furniture of our infancy; well, too, if we bring not also many a toy, and many a plaything, and many a piece of lumber. Even these pre-occupations, however, are not so obstructive as is a proneness to hypotheses, and a fond inclination to identify God's glory with the promotion of our opinions. Nay, the error goes further. Some men sit calmly down, and, after the measure of their own reason, determine and lay down the course of Divine Providence, and prescribe the exact means by which in any case God pursues and reaches his end. Having satisfied themselves as to the course which God does and must pursue, they proceed a step farther, and declare that the ascription to him of any other course is wrong, if not blasphemous, and that a due regard to his honour requires what in truth amounts to the observance of their laws and the honouring of their opinions. We confess that we always tremble when a divine begins to announce what God *must* do, and what God's glory requires man to believe. What a pitiable exhibition of folly for a mortal man to make his mind "the line and the plummet" of the mind of God, and to impose his opinions on the consciences of others, no less able to judge and no less responsible than himself! This arguing from self to the whole and making the individual mind a universal standard, this thrusting of theories on theology, this apotheosis of self in the very temple of God, must be disowned and utterly renounced, ere the divinity of the schools can rise into the dignity of biblical science, and God's own truth receive its due homage in the human soul. Unaware as they may be of the fact, these lovers of hypothesis and *à-priori* reasoners are, in spirit, in aim and in effect, though not in opinion, identical with rationalists of the worst school. Both parties have a theory for their starting-point, and both make all things bend to that theory. The two are essentially theological theorists, not biblical students. They

differ, indeed, in the accident that one is in favour and the other is against miracles and other supernatural manifestations. But this is their sole essential difference. Equally enamoured of their own notions, and equally wedded to their own methods, they carry opinions into the Bible, instead of taking the Bible as their instructor; and the moment they find a fact in the external history or the internal contents of the Bible alien to their conceptions or adverse to their methods, they resolutely tax their ingenuity to explain the obstruction away, and to compel a complete accord to their system and a thorough subservience to their aims. Thus, till the days of Kepler and Galileo, did men who were called astronomers write their own falsities on the skies, and pronounce the characters those of God's own hand. How long will it be ere theology shall profit by the wisdom of her sister science, and reverently study the heavenly book, in order there to "read, learn and inwardly digest" the declarations of the All-wise and the determinations of the All-powerful? Certainly there can be no true biblical science until assumptions of all kinds are renounced, and men, like little children, seek for divine truth "in the love of it." Here let us be permitted to cite a few illustrative words from a work which combines the processes and the results of a sound learned analysis, with those of a synthesis no less faithful than ingenious, and which may well serve in this country as a model of theological dissertation,—we mean the Chevalier Bunsen's Hippolytus:*

"At present let me only ask, Would it be fair to exclude entirely the free discussion of whether the late origin of Daniel is a (an) hypothesis or a fact? Certainly it would be not. But still ask your own conscience whether you do not in fact exclude a fair discussion, if you set down beforehand as a starting-point that it cannot be a fact, because you suppose that it would prejudge the sacred character of the book and dishonour the Bible. I cannot see the difference between such a proceeding and that of the Roman inquisitors against Galileo, which you always quote against Rome. They maintained that the honour of Scripture depended upon assuming as certain that the philosopher's system must be false; for they asserted, as the Scripture evidently supposes the sun to move and the earth to stand still, it would be impiety to admit that such a (an) hypothesis could be a fact. You ought at least to go as far as the Jesuits did in the seventeenth century, when they edited your Newton's *Principia*, as a model of ingenuity for rendering plausible a (an) hypothesis which a good Christian of course knew beforehand to be wrong. Now it is easy to see that whoever starts from the assumption that to admit such a (an) hypothesis is impiety, will never find the truth. For there is no historical truth and no philological fact against which theological obstinacy cannot raise many objections. Many of your people

* Hippolytus and his Age, or the Doctrine and Practice of the Church of Rome under Commodus and Alexander Severus, and Ancient and Modern Christianity and Divinity compared, by Christian C. J. Bunsen, D.C.L., London, 1852, Vol. IV. pp. 40, 41.

think themselves justified in asserting against an alleged historical fact its improbability, without considering that nothing is true or untrue in the eyes of history because it is probable or improbable, but simply because, assuming its general logical possibility, it can be proved to be or not to be a fact. This is a sad subterfuge of Jesuitism or of ignorance. As long as there shall be critical and honest inquiry of truth-seeking minds and courage to believe in truth, historical facts seem to me as much capable of demonstration as mathematical truths."

This indisposition to transmute the current empyrical theology into biblical science, is the more to be deplored because a practical regard to the dislike is an act of suicide. Biblical science is only a branch of general science in one view, and in another it comprises many sciences in itself. Whether we consider it as a container or as a thing contained, biblical science obviously forms a part of one great whole—is a department of the unlimited realm of knowledge. Now, in that kingdom, all the provinces, and all the cities, and all the citizens, are bound together in a mutual dependence which gives rise to universal harmony. What is truth in one department, is consequently truth in another. There is not one law for the rich and another law for the poor, but "rich and poor meet together" on the level of a common law and on the ground of a common citizenship. If so, then the science of the universe is, so far as it goes, biblical science. There cannot, in consequence, be an astronomy of the astronomers and an astronomy of the theologians. Equally impossible is it that there should be two kinds of history. Refuse to take the history of Herodotus because you may think it does not square in all points with the history of the Chronicles, and what do you? You bring into discredit one of the two authorities, and should learning vindicate Herodotus, the Bible will suffer through your lack of wisdom. By the thumbscrew of theological exegesis compel Moses to employ the language of geology as it is—he has aforetime suffered, and not once, a similar indignity—and what do you? You set an example to those who come after you to compel Moses to change his meaning in order to adapt himself to the altered phraseology of an ever-altering science. We tell you plainly that you must take secular science as it is in your own day, and leave the Bible to do now what it did at the first, namely, breathe a religious spirit through the otherwise inert mass. And you must take profane history as it presents itself, in its ever-progressive and ever-varying guises; and instead of applying a Procrustean process to profane history or sacred history, be content to recognize with thankfulness any harmony that may really exist, and expect a less incomplete harmony from fuller light. But do not commit the egregious folly of thinking that you honour the Bible by setting up on its behalf a history of its own, or a geology of its own, or an astronomy of its own. There cannot be two histories, there cannot be two

systems of astronomy, there cannot be two true geological theories. Science, in becoming biblical, does not cease to be a part of general science. Truth changes not its character by its application. After all, *science* is only a Latin term for the old Indo-Germanic *knowledge;* and the knowledge of contrarieties, the knowledge of opposites, is simply nonsense. We must, therefore, with a simple regard to truth, cultivate biblical science, if we would have our knowledge of the Bible and biblical things enter as an harmonious element into the grand category of universal science, and keep there its place undisputed and unperilled. There, indeed, it may appear, and there it ought to appear, and there by our act let it appear, as the most brilliant of all earthly luminaries, and the most powerful of all earthly potentates, precisely because it is fullest of the spirit of God, and was given to man by God's hand, at once to achieve results of its own, and to aid in their work all who in any department of knowledge "buy the truth and sell it not" (Prov. xxiii. 23).

CATHOLIC UNION.*

Mr. F. W. Newman has lately favoured the world with his views on one of the most important subjects connected with religion and Christianity, by publishing a book under the title of *Catholic Union: Essays toward a Church of the Future, as the Organization of Philanthropy.*

We intend to give some account of the theory he develops; but it is very difficult to do so, from the loose and wandering way in which he has thought proper to state what he brings forward. He has in this, as in former cases, instead of taking the pains to digest his ideas, presented them in a form so crude, that his readers are left to supply for themselves much of the connection necessary to intelligibility, and much more of the information that could at all justify assent. To a want of appreciation of the gravity and significancy of questions which he presumes to settle with a touch, there is added a method of talking about his subject instead of fairly discussing it; and on both these grounds one is continually tempted to dispute his right to undertake a work for which he was so little prepared as he has proved himself in this instance to have been.

"Catholic Union," according to Mr. Newman's conception of it, is to be sought for on moral principles alone; and "the Church of the Future," which he anticipates, is a society professedly constituted to promote the temporal welfare of humanity.

* Catholic Union: Essays toward a Church of the Future, as the Organization of Philanthropy. By F. W. Newman. Pp. 113. London—John Chapman.

To such a society we have no objection to offer. Those who entered it would have our heartiest wishes for their success. We should, indeed, esteem it an advantage that individuals, whose opinions did not permit them to join any of the existing religious organizations, connected themselves together, with some benevolent purposes in view, in place of those which these organizations contemplate. If our author had simply urged such individuals to the performance of this duty, and pointed out how it might be best accomplished, we should have applauded his efforts; but instead of that, he has set himself to disparage all other church unions besides that which he devises, and especially to plead for the necessity of his scheme on the ground of the failure of whatever has gone before it. His argument is so conducted as to be applicable to the design of shaking the faith of those who may be connected with churches of the present, rather than to that of strengthening the faith of those who may be prepared for his church of the future. Thus drawn in as we are to pass judgment, for ourselves, upon this scheme, we naturally examine it, not only as it stands related to others, but as it affects our own position as religious and Christian men.

The first thing that must strike any one who regards the matter from this point of sight is, that not only Christianity, but religion itself, is excluded from having anything to do with the formation of the union under notice. We are, it is true, told that, in the opinion of the author, this union will work toward religious objects; and it is also true that he permits the Theists who may join his association to provide on Sundays for the distinct expression of their Theism among themselves; but the church as projected is to be constituted without respect to religion of any kind.

"Such a catholic union would have no religious creed whatever: and so far from bearing within it the sectarian principle of Protestantism, it would embrace Jews, Turks, Arabs, Hindoos, Chinese,—Christians, Theists, Pantheists and Atheists,—whenever they were sincere and personally virtuous."*

"Theists, if they attempt to make and enforce upon one another an intellectual creed, will, as infallibly as any class of Christians, split themselves up into sects, and perhaps into very bigoted ones. Unless they intend their creed to embrace Polytheism and Paganism, they will need to define the attributes of the Deity; and questions will arise as to what is meant by his Omnipotence and his Government of the world. Some will regard omnipotence as no more concerned in making or unmaking the laws of gravity and cohesion, than in making or unmaking the properties of the circle: with others, it will be the cardinal point of true Theism to believe that Matter and all its powers are *creations*, and not mere *manifestations*, of the divine Will. So soon as any attempt were made to unite in Praise or in Prayer, the diversities of sentiment

* Catholic Union, p. 5.

would become prominent. Many things for which some would desire to pray, would seem to others equally wrong, as to pray for a reversing of the laws of gravitation. I do not deny that Theists could harmoniously co-operate, without schism or sects, while engaged on objects which in no respect required that their Theism should be *defined:* but, so long, why might not Pantheists or Atheists, if morally as good as some of them, also co-operate? To hold intellectually a Theistic creed, is surely no guarantee of moral goodness: and if Pantheists are to be excluded, it cannot be simply as morally unworthy, but because some work is being undertaken, for which they are obviously incapacitated. In my closing section I may touch on the after-formation of friendly sects, or rather branches, within the same moral community: it suffices here to indicate my opinion that the attempt to enact a well defined *Theistical creed* as the test of admittance to the society, would at once secure that it should not be One society, but Many; and would, at starting, reproduce the old phenomena of religious controversy, with extreme discouragement and probably with a rapid and total failure."*

So strict is the determination to make this union independent of religion, that even as to the tolerated religious exercises of professed Theists, we meet with the following drawback:

"It may be that religion for a long while has been made *too* social a thing, and that an interval of time is necessary, during which all public ordinances of religion shall be suspended,—the juices of the soul being drawn down within, as in trees during the winter season, that the glorious life may again bud forth more richly, when nature has been strengthened by repose. If such a suspense actually were experienced, I do not think we ought to feel either alarm or discomfort, as though all religion were vanishing, unless moral depravity and general levity accompanied the phenomenon. A winter of solemn repose may be healthy; but not rottenness and fungous growths."†

Now it ought to be carefully noted that no attempt is made in this book to shew, either that religion does not present a valid bond of union, or that those who possess religious faith are not under obligation to give to it practical expression. Both these things are generally thought to be sustainable enough; and if they can be sustained, Mr. Newman has committed a grave offence in proposing to religious men that they should make that compromise with their duty which the adoption of his union would imply. What is it we are asked to do, when we are thus urged to subordinate our convictions relative to the character and will of God, so that our church associations may harmonize with the convictions of those who do not believe in his existence, but to suppress that sense of divine responsibility which impels us to seek for religious sympathy, and join with others in religious acts, as a primary service of our nature. Of one thing, at least, we are well assured,—that those moral interests which are here regarded as of paramount importance can never be adequately

* Catholic Union, p. 72. † Ibid. p. 111.

preserved, while so palpable a violation of the dictates of conscience, as that which this suspension of religious exercise involves, is committed.

No one possessed of any true religious feeling can read this book without being struck with the little weight which is, throughout it, conceded to the principle of religion. The want of any due sense of the nature and conditions of that principle, is one of the most marked features of the whole discussion. It is this which lies at the bottom of the objections preferred against Christianity. We are told, for instance, that Christianity has not favoured family and national interests; that the evils of war and slavery cannot be remedied by its means; and that it leaves marriage and legislation in an altogether unsatisfactory state. The whole question of its social relations is summed up in such sentences as these:

"The churches cannot take the lead of moral and philanthropic reform of our institutions, *because this function of the Church was never contemplated in the New Testament.*"*

"The more closely one examines the phenomena, the more it appears that the precepts of Christianity, given to a small community of slaves which was shortly to be transferred to a better world, are quite unsuited to vast communities of free men which are to be permanent in this world."†

We shall not now enter upon any examination of the misrepresentations of fact which are committed on some of the points referred to above, or of the perversions of truth which attach to all of them; but we wish to fix attention upon the essential omission which neglects, in these and similar cases, to trace the influence of the distinctively religious truth and duty which it is the one great purpose of Christianity to teach. It is there, from the plainest necessities of the case, that its peculiar power lies, and nothing is done toward the setting forth of its relation to any of the interests of humanity, while that power is unnoticed or but partially acknowledged. How far the want of such acknowledgment prevails in the circumstances under our notice, may be judged of from the fact, that Mr. Newman actually reprobates the formation of the religious brotherhood itself, to which as Christians we are called.

"No brotherhood towards those who join your Union, more intimate than that which exists to those who do *not* join it, must be recognized, or it becomes something artificial, something less large than the brotherhood of humanity. When the 'New Commandment' of Jesus was given, *to love one another*, a principle was introduced, without which the religion perhaps could not have stood, yet a principle which ensured that the religion should *not* gather into one all the children of God, but should end, as Judaism, in scorn and rancour against the 'heathen.' If we want to form a Union which shall be human, and not sectarian, truly

* Catholic Union, p. 51. † Ibid. p. 55.

and not artificially moral, we must not admit the idea, that a man *earns a new moral position by joining it.*"*

How this dictum squares with what is elsewhere so positively and earnestly said about the obligation of preserving family relationships and patriotic feelings we do not know; nor do we know how it is meant to be carried out in the face of those selections and exclusions which are meant to distinguish Mr. Newman's own church. When we are told that the object to be primarily aimed at in that church, is "to attract to our society the purest and freest minds of the age;" that "quality, not numbers, is in the first instance to be alone thought of;" and that "to be strong is of course useful, but strength is the result, not of mere numbers, but of steady concord and community of aim;"†—we naturally infer that something like a brotherhood is contemplated separate from the vast family of man. We should like to see how it could be shewn that Christianity was not entitled to the benefit of such a sentiment as this—"Our actions *must* be close at home, and our affections *ought* to be peculiarly there."‡ But setting aside the inconsistency with which this objection to a Christian brotherhood is advanced, we desire specially to mark the forgetfulness of the necessary operations of the religious principle which its advancement implies. The mutual worship and fear of one Heavenly Father must produce such a brotherhood; and to represent it as an injurious or a useless thing, is to throw discredit upon the principle itself from which it cannot but arise.

We are sorry to make anything like a personal application of the remarks we have just offered; but the manner in which Mr. Newman has formerly come before the public obliges us to say, that his hostility to Christianity has evidently affected the whole tone of his thought, so far as to lead him to treat matters connected with religion in an entirely different spirit from that which, in an earlier part of his career, he was accustomed to display. We lament, though we do not wonder at, this degeneracy. When we think upon the many rash and uncalled-for imputations upon Christianity which this book contains, we cannot but come to the conclusion already glanced at, that a destructive aim was far more present to the mind of its author than the constructive one he professes; and when we mark how transparently the plan of his contemplated association is adapted to meet the particular views of the party called Secularists, this conclusion becomes confirmed in our minds. The whole business appears to us, indeed, to be just this,—that Mr. Newman hereby expresses his readiness to accommodate himself to the demands of Atheism, for the purpose of forming a stronger anti-christian league.

We will turn, for a little longer, to view this scheme of Catho-

---

* Catholic Union, p. 58. † Ibid. p. 62. ‡ Ibid. p. 83.

lic Union in the light of its own merits. Morality, we have said, is proposed as the sole principle on which the union should be constituted. It is natural to inquire, on hearing such a proposal, what are the moral doctrines which the society is to profess, and what are the moral objects to which it is to be directed? So natural are these inquiries, that Mr. Newman has two chapters respectively entitled, *Doctrines of the Future Church* and *Work of the Future Church.* It may seem passing strange, after this, to be informed that the church ought to be characterized by no doctrine, and to have no work assigned to it; but such is the case. Both doctrine and work are to grow up within the association after its establishment, but it is to be established independently of any definition of either. This matter had better be expressed in Mr. Newman's own words. As to doctrine, he says,

"In the candidate's profession just laid down, no moral *doctrines* are assumed and enacted. If a Milton proposed himself, believing polygamy to be moral and rightful, he would not be shut out of the society thereby. So long as it was a speculation with him, it might possibly be disagreeable, but it would be borne with. If however this, or any other moral eccentricity, took a practical shape which appeared scandalous to the community, a delicate practical question might certainly arise: but it is not new with churches or other associations, nor is it to be expected to occur often in any one place."*

Much the same lesson is taught by him as to work:

"No greater error, I believe, could be, than for a Society which aims at permanence and indefinite good to overrate immediate success in a single object, and for it to sacrifice any portion of its vital force. If by *work* is understood 'action that affects those without,' we must not be too eager for immediate work. To exist, is earlier than to act; and our first action is for and on ourselves, not on others."†

"I do not see that it is necessary here to put forth any definite suggestions as to the work which the society might undertake *first;*—that is matter for after-deliberation:—and in regard to the details of starting, I believe it suffices to say that, as in a political revolution, where there is predisposition, a spark will light the train. If we are inwardly prepared, there are twenty ways of commencing: if not, all ways are futile."‡

We would observe, on the last extracts, regarded by themselves, that the course they recommend is quite inconsistent with the blame cast upon Christianity for not grappling, by direct precept, with the social evils of the world. It might, we think, have been remembered, that a religious principle, implanted in the heart, would operate upon society according to its character, when it was intended to place so much reliance on the similar undefined operation of a moral principle.

On the extract relating to doctrine, we have to remark, that it is a mere delusion to suppose that a religious or moral society

* Catholic Union, p. 76. † Ibid. p. 94. ‡ Ibid. p. 95.

formed upon the rejection of all statements of religion or morality, is, on that account, without doctrine. The rejection includes a doctrine just as much as an acceptance of the rejected statements would do. The difference between the two things, where the interest with which the statements have to do is preserved, is not that between doctrine and no doctrine, but between positive and negative doctrine. Mr. Newman's church would impose an adherence to a certain moral theory upon its members, by the mere fact of refusing to define any speculative moral error. It would do so as long as it made morality the basis of its association. So, in religion, a society, as long as it cultivates religion, upholds certain doctrinal views with regard to it by excluding the intellectual assent which Christianity requires, as well as by insisting upon that assent. This very obvious truth is a sufficient answer to a great deal contained in this and other books touching the philosophy of the question in hand.

Let us, however, face the twofold position before us, as its author has laid it down, and ask what it really means. All definition of doctrine and purpose is to be prohibited in this moral union. What, then, is to constitute the bond of union? We answer, *Character*. The members are to be satisfied of each other's goodness: on that principle they are to unite: and when dissatisfied in this particular, they are, on the same principle, to dissociate themselves.

"It is not the profession of a *theory* that we must seek and accept, but the profession of a *practical intention*. It will not do to receive any one at random as member of the society, nor yet can it be right to exercise any judgment upon one who is a candidate for admittance,—except in the extreme case of his conduct being publicly scandalous: but we may require of him a solemn declaration, that 'he desires to join our union, not from selfish or ambitious motives, but, believing that Moral Excellence is the highest good of man, and desiring to promote that good, in himself and others, through Justice and Love.'"*

How curiously, by the way, this word "believing" sounds, in connection with the repudiation of doctrine with which we have, on this very topic, to deal!

"The power of Exclusion, so essential to every voluntary society, has been so much abused, and is become so odious under its ecclesiastical name Excommunication, that it may here deserve and need some remarks, more particularly since to inflict exclusion on purely moral grounds is a social stigma and might take a form involving legal controversy. In the first place, it seems impossible to forbid, in the abstract, all disowning of members; since a person may be so quarrelsome and uncontrollable, that nothing short of suspending him from the exercise of every right given by the society to its members will hinder his being mischievous to all its objects. Next, it seems equally necessary to admit that every locally constituent part of the society will most appropriately judge what is necessary in this respect for its own defence."†

* Catholic Union, p. 75. † Ibid. p. 76.

Surely one might suppose that the least reflection upon the point would be sufficient to convince every right-minded man that this character-test was far more dangerous than any other bond of union which could be applied. Who does not know that it is this which has been one of the very sorest evils in Christian church associations? Who does not instinctively feel that it must in an equal degree foster pride and originate tyranny? A union based upon the acknowledgment of some moral principle, or constituted for the fulfilment of some moral purpose, though liable to abuse, would, in the very character of its construction, have securities against those personal wrongs in which the worst abuses of such societies is to be found; but a union which presumes to estimate "the practical intention" of its members, and to exclude them "on purely moral grounds," would necessarily entertain exaggerated ideas of its own merit, and indulge unsocial feelings toward those with whom it came into collision. Moral judgment upon our fellow-creatures is just that kind of judgment with which, from the nature of the subject, we should have as little as possible to do in our intercourse with each other: and it is because of the great and peculiar danger connected with its exercise, that, as Mr. Newman here intimates, law is obliged to step forward to prevent the injury of which it may be the cause.

As might be expected, a considerable space of these essays is occupied in fixing the economical regulations which are to prevail through the union. This, from the nature of the plan, is almost all that is left to be done. A great deal is therefore said about the office of Chairman, the appointment of Committees, the rights and forms of address, and the general by-laws of the community. We have no intention of directing our arrows against this small deer; but we wish to observe that these regulations must result in the establishment of a sect, as precisely limited in its character as any other sect may be. We make the observation because so much is said in opposition to sectarianism, as to convey the impression that, in that particular, the contemplated union is unlike associations assuming a religious or Christian name. We are far from regarding it as blameable on this account. There is nothing evil in sectarianism considered by itself. There are wrong principles on which it may be constructed, and there is an evil spirit which may take advantage of its organization; but the thing itself is as right as it is necessary. We are accustomed, indeed, to reprobate the sectarianism which has grown up in connection with Christianity; but we do so, not because there is any valid objection to the formation of a sect as such, but because the principles of the Christian sect have already been fixed independently of the efforts of its members. The formation of sects within its pale is a violation of those principles. Let Christians, as they are bound to do by their common

profession, adhere to what constitutes the Christian sect, and we can have no quarrel with them on sectarian grounds. The quarrel does not commence until they adopt a constitution which narrows the original basis of Christianity, and thus divides the body of believers who were intended to be one.

We had intended to give some specimens of the carelessness and uncertainty we have mentioned as pervading Mr. Newman's exposition of his views; but we have already devoted more time to the book than its intrinsic worth requires, and must omit this, with some other topics which we had marked for notice. In order to part with a friendly word, we may say that, scattered throughout the volume, there are some valuable observations; and the two chapters called *Retrospect of the Catholic Church*, and *Present State of Protestantism*, though liable to considerable exceptions, are especially worthy of careful perusal.

Just as we had finished reading this work of Mr. Newman, there came to our hands the admirable sermon of Mr. Higginson preached at the last meeting of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, and entitled, *The Church of the Free-born.* We could not fail to compare the one with the other; and although Mr. Higginson does not directly meet any of the points mooted by Mr. Newman, we are persuaded that the moral influence exerted by his exposition of the principles which should regulate the administration of a Christian church, would alone be sufficient to vindicate to the heart the superiority of that *Catholic Union* which he identifies with the gospel, and to counteract, in the most effectual manner, much more than has been said, in the production immediately before us, against the claims of the religion of Jesus to be the best bond of spiritual brotherhood between man and man.

C.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE AND HER NONCONFORMIST SONS.

Of the three greatest men that owned her for their Alma Mater, two at least—and perhaps the third—could not now declare themselves *bonâ fide* members of the Church of England, and must then for ever remain upon the list of under-graduates. Oliver Cromwell must get his degree, not as member of Sydney Sussex College, but as he can from an Independent Academy. John Milton's "Discourse on Christian Doctrine" must not be suspected, or Christ's College will never see her noblest inmate a Bachelor of Arts; and if the presiding genius of "Trinity" is to be Isaac Newton, he must conceal his Arian tendencies, especially from the delighted eye of that heretic, Will Whiston of Clare Hall.

Surely anomalies like these should be at once removed, and the ancient Universities become once again the Universities of the nation.—*From the Introduction to the "Speeches on University Reform delivered at Liverpool."*

MR. BAKER'S LECTURES ON NONCONFORMITY IN BOLTON.*

Among the more prosperous English Presbyterian congregations of South Lancashire, that of Bolton-le-Moors occupies a most respectable position. In respect to the number of the congregation, the regularity of their attendance, and the zealous support of Sunday-schools and other useful congregational institutions, this society is scarcely surpassed by any Unitarian congregation in the county. The publication which now asks the notice of our readers, is a token of the prosperity and progressive character of the Bank-Street congregation. The "Historical Sketch" now before us was given in a series of four farewell discourses preached in the ancient chapel, preparatory to its being pulled down to make way on the same site for a larger building, and one more accommodated to existing ecclesiastical tastes. The meeting-houses of our Presbyterian ancestors, so simple in their design and plain in execution, with their square ground plan, square seats and square windows, sternly utilitarian in every feature, are fast disappearing, and are being supplanted by edifices more distinctly ecclesiastical in their character, which imitate, with varying success, the beautiful parish churches which have for centuries adorned our land.

We are always pleased to receive congregational histories. They can generally be best executed by persons on the spot, who have gathered up with reverential interest the fragments of tradition handed down from one generation of worshipers to another, and who have carefully collected all existing pamphlets of the last two centuries containing any snatches of local history. There is an inconvenience in giving these congregational histories in the shape of pulpit lectures. The *genius loci* forbids the introduction of those anecdotes and pleasantries which often exhibit the spirit of an era or a person's character better than any elaborate statement. But by resorting in publication to the use of illustrative notes, the preacher may combine this source of instruction and amusement with the solemn interest which attaches to a pulpit discourse.

Mr. Baker has, in the rise and progress of Nonconformity in Bolton, a very fine subject, and he has executed his task with much knowledge, ability and taste. He is less full in respect to the rise than he is as to the progress of the Nonconformity of Bolton. For the beginning of the long series of influences which led to the secession of the Two Thousand Nonconformist clergy throughout England, we must study Puritan history and ransack

* The Rise and Progress of Nonconformity in Bolton. An Historical Sketch of a Congregation of Protestant Dissenters assembling first in Deansgate and afterwards in Bank Street. In Four Lectures, delivered at the close of the Year 1853. By Franklin Baker, M. A., Minister of the Chapel. 8vo. Pp. 116. London—Whitfield.

Puritan biographies for several generations anterior to the memorable Bartholomew's Day of 1662. In many cases, the seed which grew up to a goodly plant in the 17th century, was actually sown by the Marian martyrs of the preceding century. The history of the Nonconformists of South Lancashire is a disjointed and perplexing fragment, unless read as the sequel of the history of the Reformers and Puritans of an earlier age. The lives and works of Bradford, Pilkington, Lever, the two Nowells and others of the Reformers, must be familiar to us, if we would enter into the spirit of such men as Martindale, Newcome, Goodwin, Pendlebury and Oliver Heywood. Mr. H. Taylor has well observed in a passage (quoted by Mr. Baker), that "the wild regions of Lancashire presented a place of refuge for the persecuted, both Protestant and Papist, during the reigns of Mary and Elizabeth, and the history of some of the transactions at this early period affords much interesting matter for antiquarian research." We should have been glad if Mr. Baker had acted on this hint, and given us a picture of the religious life of Bolton in the days of Mary and Elizabeth, and also of the first Charles. There are abundant materials for such a picture, without any resort to imagination. The struggle between Popery and Protestantism, and the opposite principles respectively embodied in them, of authority and the right of private judgment, was in Lancashire the more eager from the numbers and influence of the Roman Catholic party. When the Puritans of Manchester and the neighbouring towns asserted the principles of the Reformation, they did it with the evils of Popery visibly before their eyes. They saw and felt the intellectual prostration and the spiritual degradation which Popery fastened on its votaries; therefore they put on the whole armour of God to do battle with it, and asserted with all their strength the right and duty of every man to study the Scriptures, and the sufficiency of those Scriptures, without the aid of priests or the sacraments of a church, for salvation.

In addition to all this, the political struggles that took place in the reign of the first Charles, exercised large influence on the religious struggles and the continued endurance of religious confessors after the restoration of Charles II. This was emphatically the case at Bolton. The survivors and sons of those who had perilled their lives or shed their blood in defending Bolton against the impetuous siege and murderous sacking of the town by Prince Rupert (on which occasion the ministers of religion within the walls aided the besieged both by their prayers and otherwise), would think with bitterness that the King who had so grossly deceived them by his declaration, at Breda, of respect for the religious convictions of his subjects, was the cousin and the personal friend of the Prince who had formerly given up their town to the enormities of an enraged and brutal soldiery.

Without alluding further to the interesting events and noble

characters connected with Bolton anterior to those described by Mr. Baker, we proceed to make some extracts from his history of the ministers of the Deansgate and Bank-Street chapels. He begins his volume by the following roll of ministers, which also contains the place of their education and the period of their pastorship.

"Richard Goodwin, M.A. Emanuel College, Cambridge 1672 to 1685
John Lever. Brazen Nose College, Oxford..... 1685 to 1692
Robert Seddon, M.A. Christ's College, Cambridge .. 1692 to 1695
Samuel Bourn. Emanuel College, Cambridge ..... 1695 to 1719
Thos. Dixon, M.D. Rev. Jas. Coningham and Scotland 1719 to 1729
John Buck. (Not ascertained)..... 1729 to 1750
Thomas Dixon, fil. Dr. Caleb Rotheram ..... 1752 to 1754
Philip Holland. Dr. Doddridge ..... 1755 to 1789
Wm. Hawkes (assistant), Rev. T. Robins and Dr. Aikin 1785 to 1789
John Holland. Rev. Thomas Belsham ..... 1789 to 1820
Noah Jones. Wymondley ..... 1821 to 1822
Franklin Baker, M.A. University of Glasgow ..... 1823."

P. iii.

The founders of Nonconformist worship in Bolton were the vicar and lecturer who were ejected in 1662, viz., Rev. Richard Goodwin and Rev. Robert Park. Of the former, Mr. Baker gives this account:

"The Rev. Richard Goodwin, whom we have recognised as the founder of this society, lived for a few years after his ejectment from the vicarage, while the Five Mile Act was in force, in seclusion near Manchester. Some relaxation in the law was made in 1672, by which the nonconformist divines were permitted to preach under certain restrictions. At that favourable period it was that he took out a license to preach in a house, which he or his friends had built on the south side of Deansgate, at the corner of Meal-House Lane, where he had service twice every Lord's-day. The ornaments and fittings on these premises, used now as dwelling houses, are sufficiently perfect to attest for what purpose they were originally designed. In this edifice, or in a more ancient building, recently taken down, on the north side of Nelson Square, called Barrett's Barn, the principles of Protestant Dissent were first asserted in the town of Bolton-le-Moors, and public testimony was borne to their popularity by numerous families, who had made costly sacrifices for the sake of vindicating the rights of conscience in matters of faith and judgment. Here the ejected minister continued to preach for about thirteen years, in the only place of religious worship then in the town besides the parish church. The population, hardly a fraction of what it is at present, generally gave their sympathy to their old pastor, even if they attended public worship at the parish church; while the more ardent of his adherents, especially those who appreciated the principle of the separation, and preferred the spirit or system of nonconformity, attached themselves with zeal to the new congregation, revered its minister, and identified themselves with the cause which they had so nobly supported.

"Many of the presbyterian families were bound by ties of kindred as

well as affection to the ejected ministers. Mr. Goodwin himself was by marriage connected with many respectable families in the town. Others of the ejected divines were natives of the town or neighbourhood. Among these, none had a wider circle of family connexions than Oliver Heywood, whose attachment to the cause of nonconformity in these parts, was shewn by the efforts made by him in his frequent visits to keep alive its interests. Even at this distance of time it is pleasant to be able to trace, from his diaries, the very days that he preached, and the texts that he discoursed upon, in the pulpit of the Meeting House in Deansgate. On the 18th of September, 1672, a few months after it was opened, we find that he preached there. At the beginning of March, 1677, he was at the parish church, as a hearer of a funeral sermon for his father, preached by Mr. Tildesley, from 2 Timothy, i. 12. On the second of October, 1682, he attended the Monday's lecture as a hearer. In May, 1694, he preached a funeral sermon for Peter Heywood, one of his kinsmen, who had suddenly expired on the road, as he was going to Bury fair. In June, 1696, when the congregation was on the eve of removing to the new chapel in Bank-street, he preached there for the last time, on Isaiah xliv. 22, and administered the Lord's Supper at noon to about five hundred communicants. And on the day following went to hear Mr. Walker preach the lecture.

"Mr. Goodwin, the first of our roll of ministers, died on the 12th of December, 1685, at the advanced age of seventy-two. He was interred within the parish church, though the exact spot is not indicated by any monumental memorial. Calamy, the biographer of the Bartholomew divines, describes him as 'a plain, practical preacher,' and as 'having an excellent gift in prayer.' 'Such was his usefulness,' he adds, 'that he will have a great retinue of souls to present to his Master at the last day.'"—Pp. 14—16.

Of Mr. Goodwin's colleague, Mr. Park, the account given by Mr. Baker is still more interesting:

"The Rev. Robert Park, the ejected lecturer, who is described as the assistant of Mr. Goodwin, could not have taken any part in the service of 'the Meeting Place' in Deansgate, as he died in 1669, three years before it was opened, at the age of seventy. What is probable is, that during the stormy conflicts that banished so many families from the church, he united with Mr. Goodwin in supplying to them, as far as those times of persecution permitted, religious instruction and consolation. As they had been colleagues in office and companions in adversity, they would naturally become coadjutors in carrying out the principles for which they both had made such extraordinary sacrifices.

"The life of the Rev. Robert Park was a life of unusual vicissitude. A native of Bolton, he became also vicar of the parish. At the time of the civil wars, when the town was in possession of Prince Rupert, he withdrew into Holland, and preached in the English church at Rotterdam. Four years after the Commonwealth was established, he was invited to take the vacant office of lecturer, and concurring with Mr. Goodwin, the vicar, in his views of the disputed questions of the day, they lived in great harmony and friendship, pursuing the same plans, and following the same fortunes, until separated by the hand of death.

When Mr. Goodwin fled to Manchester under the operation of the Five Mile Act, Mr. Park found a retirement in Broughton, where he remained till it was safe for him to return to the scene of his labours. No one ever illustrated the fond attachment to home, so beautifully described by Goldsmith, more than Mr. Park. Twice was he driven away from it by inauspicious events, and twice did he return to it again. He might have exclaimed with the poet's 'Traveller,'—

> 'And as a hare, whom hounds and horns pursue,
> Pants to the place from whence at first she flew,
> I still had hopes, my long vexations past,
> Here to return, and die at home at last.'

"His funeral sermon was preached by Oliver Heywood, but in what building his audience assembled there is not even a tradition!"—Pp. 16—18.

It is indeed matter of wonder and regret to those curious in congregational histories, that in the course of less than two centuries so many particulars which we would gladly know are irretrievably lost. In some cases, not merely the sites of early Nonconformist places of worship are forgotten, but the very names of the ministers are unknown. Although Bolton is not particularly distinguished by the richness of its traditions, we must be thankful to have at least a continuous outline of its religious history. It owes much to the labours and virtues of the ejected clergy. The next name enumerated by Mr. Baker is Mr. Lever.

"Rev. John Lever, who came to reside in Bolton, was also a native of the town, and had received his education in the grammar school there prior to his removal to Brazen-nose College, Oxford. His father is said to have been a papist, but the son appears to have had no predilection for the religious opinions of his family. At the time of the passing of the Act of Uniformity, the Rev. John Lever was minister of an extra-parochial chapel at Cockey Moor, and refusing to subscribe the Declarations required from all who continued in the church, he spent the remainder of his life in the town or neighbourhood of Bolton, preaching and celebrating the rites of religion as often as he had opportunity. There is no evidence of Mr. Lever having established any Meeting Place separate from the one already described, though it is probable that the nonconformist families in the rural districts would often require the aid of their respective pastors in private as well as in public. In the performance of such duties, Mr. Lever appears to have occupied himself, until the decline and death of Mr. Goodwin devolved upon him the pastorship of the nonconformist congregation which had already partially engaged his ministrations. He was Mr. Goodwin's successor in the 'Meeting Place' in Deansgate, where, his biographer states, 'he administered the Lord's Supper every month to some hundreds. * * * Mr. Lever lived for seven years after the death of Mr. Goodwin; at the expiration of which time the congregation had the misfortune to lose by death the services of another of those holy men whose lives have borne such irrefragable testimony to their sincerity and piety. He died July 4th, 1692, in the 58th year of his age."—Pp. 18—20.

The fourth and last of the ejected clergy whose memory is entwined with the history of the Bolton congregation, is Rev. Robert Seddon.

"His native place was Outwood, in the parish of Prestwich, where his family had an estate. Having taken his degree at Christ's College, Cambridge, he lived for a short time in Mr. Angier's family, with whom he had become acquainted while that holy man officiated at Ringley, the church nearest to his father's house. Mr. Seddon received Presbyterian ordination from the Manchester Classis in the year 1654, on being called to the ministry in Gorton chapel. He was in possession of the rectory at Langley, in Derbyshire, when he was silenced. Having, like the Rev. Henry Newcome, of Manchester, embraced the king's cause, he incurred suspicion, and was near losing his life. After passing nearly thirty years in the vicissitudes of these unsettled times, and having been twice imprisoned, he at length fixed his residence in this town, to which he was probably attracted, not only by its contiguity to his own birthplace, but by its being the favourite resort of so many of the suffering clergy, and the seat of so flourishing a body of Protestant Dissenters. He took a house, which he afterwards purchased, at the top of Bank-street, then called Windy-bank, near the spot where we are now assembled, and there he spent the last three years of his life, in a state of tranquillity to which he must have been a stranger during the long interval which followed his removal from Langley.

"The settlement of the Rev. Robert Seddon in Bolton was the cause of such an important change in the outward condition of this society, that it is entitled to be distinguished as an era in the history of Protestant Dissent in this town. It was not so much from his ministerial labours that this change proceeded; for his life was but of short duration after he fixed his residence in Bolton. He lived to discharge the duties of his ministry for three years only, during which period his vigour of mind as well as body must have been on the decline; for he was not only suffering from a wasting complaint, but had arrived at the age of sixty-six.

"The congregation still assembled in 'the Meeting Place' in Deansgate. The increased toleration granted at the Revolution operated powerfully in favour of Dissent, and stimulated at once the number and zeal of its adherents. In every district where the Nonconformists were numerous, preparations were made for establishing places of worship on a more permanent basis. The Dissenters of Bolton participated in this feeling. And their pastor, in order to encourage the erection of a more commodious Meeting House, became himself a munificent benefactor to it by presenting an ample piece of land for the purpose. * * * He himself lived only just long enough to complete the deed by which he conferred his bounty, and then died of a paralytic stroke, at the house of his brother, Captain Peter Seddon, in which indeed he was born. * * * His death took place March 25th, 1696; and his remains lie in the family vault near the chancel of Ringley church."—Pp. 20—23.

Some years before this, a lecture had been established in Bolton by Mr. Nathaniel Hulton, a wealthy merchant of London, born at Breightmet, near Bolton. The lecture was to be preached on the market-day, Monday, and obtained considerable celebrity;

and it is a notable circumstance, that in the application for a licence to the new meeting-house, the congregation allege that the lecture "cannot reasonably be supposed to be any nuisance or hindrance to the market, since we have, on the contrary, experienced that the lecture hitherto hath been an advantage to it."

The successor of Mr. Seddon was his nephew, Rev. Samuel Bourn, who removed from Calne to Bolton in 1695. He preached for about twelve months in the chapel in Deansgate, and then, in the autumn of 1696, removed to the new chapel in Bank Street.

The original deed is remarkably free from every restrictive "doctrinal" clause. It describes the "chapel or oratory" as "a place for religious worship only, and for an assembly of a particular congregation of Protestants dissenting from the Church of England, for the free exercise of divine worship therein." The minister is to be "a Protestant minister of the gospel dissenting from the Church of England." Mr. Bourn's life was spared till his 74th year, and he died in 1719, after four-and-twenty years of service to his attached flock.

Mr. Bourn was succeeded by Rev. Thomas Dixon, a Master of Arts and Doctor of Medicine. Of him, Mr. Baker says,

"Little is known of this gentleman beyond what is preserved on the mural tablet in this place. He is there styled 'the prince of theologians,' in allusion to the honourable occupation in which he had been employed previously to his removal to Bolton. For a series of years he had, in addition to his pastoral charge, conducted an academy at Whitehaven. And his learning and his sentiments may be justly inferred from the fact of his having been the preceptor of such men as Dr. John Taylor of Norwich, Dr. Benson of London, Dr. Rotheram of Kendal, and Dr. Winder of Liverpool, with others equally well known as decided Arians, or the advocates of a rational theology. Dr. Dixon came to Bolton in 1719. For ten years his ministerial services were enjoyed by the congregation, when he was removed by the hand of death, August 14th, 1729, at the age of fifty years."—Pp. 43, 44.

In a note in the Appendix, Mr. Baker adds,—

"It is not known from what family he descended, nor in what college he took his degrees. There is among the ministers who lost their livings in the county of Durham, one of the name of the Rev. Thomas Dixon, ejected from the church at Kellow in a violent manner. It is stated that he continued a Nonconformist. Probably this was the father of Dr. Thomas Dixon."—Pp. 105.

In the *Christian Reformer* for December, 1847 (see p. 710), we gave some particulars of Dr. Dixon, stating that he was the son of a Churchman; that he studied under Messrs. Cunningham and Chorlton at Manchester, and then removed to London; that while there he paid the closest attention to the controversy on Nonconformity carried on between Bishop Hoadly and Dr. Calamy, and, deciding in favour of moderate Nonconformity, settled as a Dissenting minister at Bolton in 1719, where he performed a triple and extraordinary combination of duties, being at the

same time pastor, physician and tutor; and that he took his degree in Medicine after his removal to Bolton. In making his own conjecture, rather than accepting our statement, Mr. Baker was of course unacquainted with the authority on which it rests. We now refer him (as it would have been proper that we should have done in the first instance) to our authority, which is unquestionable. The statement is abridged from a much fuller narrative given by Dr. George Benson in his valuable Memoir of Dr. Winder, of Liverpool. The University degree of M.A., to which Mr. Baker objects as a difficulty in the way of our statement, may be easily accounted for. At the same Scottish University, perhaps Glasgow, at which he obtained his Medical diploma, he might also at the same time obtain his Master's degree. The fact supposes some intellectual activity, but is not at all impossible. The session at Glasgow may be made very short both to students in Arts and Medicine.

Dr. Dixon was succeeded at Bolton by Rev. John Buck, whose ministry continued for twenty-one years. From a MS. sermon, the last ever preached by Mr. Buck, Mr. Baker draws, on grounds which cannot be shaken, the inference that Mr. Buck was in theology anti-calvinistic and decidedly liberal. Mr. Baker begins the line of Arian ministers at Bolton with Mr. Bourn. The first Unitarian minister he supposes to have been Mr. Dixon, the son of Dr. Dixon, who, previously to his settlement at Bolton, had been colleague to Dr. John Taylor, of Norwich. Of this excellent man we gave in a former volume (1847) some account, derived in part from MS. authorities. The most important addition made by Mr. Baker relates to the consequences of Mr. Dixon's heretical preaching:

"The religious opinions entertained and zealously advocated by the last minister, were by no means calculated to reconcile that portion of the congregation which had leanings to Calvinism, and had been offended with the Arianism of his predecessors. Doubtless this doctrinal discontent had been one element in the dissensions of former years, and aggravated the difficulties which again protracted the appointment of a suitable successor to Mr. Dixon for more than a year and a half.

"It was ultimately brought to a close by the secession of the party whose predilections were for Calvinism. And this was the origin of the first congregation of Independents in this town. The seceders established themselves in a chapel, built in Duke's Alley, about 1754."—Pp. 57, 58.

After Mr. Dixon, came the long and honourable ministry of Philip Holland, and of his son, John Holland, extending from 1755 to 1820. The memoirs of these two worthy men are, as might be expected, full and interesting, and the latter memoir gives indications of the writer's personal knowledge and individual appreciation of character. The passage which follows is very curious:

"The times in which Mr. John Holland lived, and particularly the commencement of his ministerial career, called forth one of the prominent features of his character. His intrepidity in persisting to preach the doctrines of Unitarianism, denounced on all sides as they were as destructive to Christianity and hostile to civil government, drew upon him the frequent remonstrances of many of the more timid of his own friends, besides an accumulation of odium from religious and political opponents. His utter disregard to all opposition, when truth and justice required him to speak and act, rendered him still further obnoxious to the cry of 'Church and King,' which then echoed through the country. On one occasion he was burnt in effigy, and on another he was represented riding on an ass, as chief mourner, in a procession intended as a mock celebration of the funeral of the author of 'the Rights of Man!'

"These disgraceful scenes, like the riots at Birmingham, were only the ebullitions of party rancour, rendered frantic by the French Revolution, and the progress of public opinion to more patriotic principles of government and a wider extension of religious liberty!"—Pp. 67, 68.

It will perhaps be convenient that we should here insert a communication which we have received from a respected correspondent, a relative of the late Rev. John Holland:

"Loughborough, June 15, 1854.

"Sir,—I have been very much gratified by the perusal of Rev. Franklin Baker's 'Rise and Progress of Nonconformity in Bolton,' and by the very accurate delineation which he has given of the characters of two of my relations, who for so long a time filled the station now so worthily occupied by Mr. Baker. There are, however, one or two trifling errata in his account. He says, p. 58, 'The Rev. Philip Holland removed hither from Wem, in Shropshire, in the autumn of 1755.' Now I think Rev. Philip Holland never was minister of Wem. He was, I know, minister of Wolverhampton, in Staffordshire, in 1745, and I think it was from that place that he removed to Bolton. Again, p. 58, Mr. Baker says, 'The Rev. Thomas Holland, of Wem, brought up two other sons, besides his eldest son Philip, to the ministry, at the Dissenting Academy in Northamptonshire, then under the direction of Dr. Doddridge.' Now, first, Rev. Thomas Holland only brought up two of his sons to the ministry, namely, Philip, and Henry, afterwards minister at Ormskirk. Rev. John Holland, author of a volume of sermons, which bear perhaps rather too much the character of moral essays, and who died young, was the son, not of Rev. Thomas Holland, but of his elder brother, Mr. John Holland, of Mobberley, whose daughter Catharine was the wife of Rev. Philip Holland, and thus the Rev. John Holland was his brother by marriage, which probably has occasioned Mr. Baker's mistake. Again, Rev. Philip Holland was, I believe, a pupil of Dr. Rotheram's, of Kendal. In the list of my uncle John Holland's publications, is mentioned 'A

System of Modern Geography.' Now that was almost entirely my father's, the annexed Sketch of Ancient Geography, and the section on Scotland in the Modern Geography, being the only parts that were written by my uncle. Again, 'Exercises for the Memory and Understanding.' The first three editions of this were my father's, and contained several original pieces of his, written expressly for the purpose of making the compilation peculiarly appropriate for a girl's school, a purpose of which my uncle in the fourth edition seems to have lost sight. All the pieces marked T. H. in the index to the fourth edition, are my father's, and the third edition contained a great many more. With the exception of these trifling errata, I have great pleasure in bearing my testimony to the accuracy of Mr. Baker's account, and to the correctness of his delineations of character. I should be glad if he would be so good as to inform your readers what has been done with the endowment of the lecture left by Mr. Nathaniel Hulton. I am, yours, &c.,

THOMAS CROMPTON HOLLAND."

We have marked one or two errata. At p. 93, line 8 from the bottom, the date 1768 is given for, we imagine, 1678. A few lines above, the reference is made to p. 11, instead of 15. At p. 95, Cestriencis is put for Cestriensis; and at p. 106, in a quotation from ourselves, Hoadly is wrongly spelt Hoadley.

They who have attempted the composition of a congregational history, well know how difficult it is, from the paucity of materials, to avoid the commission of errors. We hope that Mr. Baker will be encouraged to produce hereafter a second edition of his "Historical Sketch," and that he will be enabled to increase its value by his continued researches and the discovery of new illustrative matter. In the mean time, we cordially thank him for a valuable addition to the religious history of Lancashire, and, before parting with the subject, offer another extract to our readers:

"It is curious at a retrospective glance at a century that is past and gone, to note changes of various kinds which have gradually established themselves, indicating other changes in the habits and tastes of a people. Some of these have been already adverted to. Another relates to the time of the afternoon service, which used to commence an hour and a half earlier than at present. On a manuscript sermon of the Rev. Thos. Dixon, in possession of a friend, is the following notice: 'October 8th, 1732, The afternoon service to begin at one o'clock exactly, and so continue till the 25th of March.' At what period the later hour of our present assembling was adopted, I have not been able to discover. Repeated reference has been made in these discourses to the lecture established by Mr. Nathaniel Hulton. For nearly a hundred and twenty years that lecture was preached in the Presbyterian chapel on Monday, the market day, for thirty weeks successively from the first Monday in March. In the year 1800, the time of delivering the lecture was

changed from Monday to Sunday evening, and thus it continued till the year 1843, when it was suspended by the trustees, and neither lecturers nor catechist have been appointed since.

"From the first establishment of this religious society, the form of service has been that in use amongst the Presbyterians. The psalmody also was conducted on the same model, being led by a precentor or leader, until the year 1792, when an organ was introduced into the chapel. The objection of Nonconformists to instrumental music, having no better foundation than their antipathy to Romanism, in whose worship music forms so pleasing and prominent a part, gradually wore away as a more enlightened and liberal spirit took the place of religious animosity and bigotry."—Pp. 68, 69.

MR. EVERETT ON THE VALUE OF THE SCRIPTURES.

This accomplished statesman and scholar, whose recent retirement from public life on the ground of broken health others besides his countrymen regret, has contributed to a volume just issued by the American Bible Society, entitled, "Testimony of distinguished Laymen to the Value of the Holy Scriptures, particularly in their Bearing on Civil and Social Life," the following valuable letter.

Washington, November 20, 1852.

Dear Sir,—I have much pleasure in complying with your request, that I would express my opinion of the importance of the Bible in connexion with the concerns of political and public life. In this respect, I am convinced that very inadequate ideas of its value are entertained by many persons, who otherwise regard it with veneration. They reverence it as the record of our religion, and consequently as a suitable book to be read in places of worship, and studied by serious persons in aid of their private devotions; but they have a vague notion that the practical business of life is carried on without reference to it, and that the Bible is not and cannot be applied to the management of what they call worldly affairs on a great or small scale.

This I consider a very erroneous view, though it has been encouraged, perhaps, by the discrimination, often stated in the pulpit, between Religion and what is called the World, as if their spheres were totally distinct.

In a letter addressed to the committee of the Maryland Bible Society, three or four years ago, I expressed the opinion, that the Bible is the ultimate foundation of the most characteristic portion of our modern European and American civilization, that is, of those portions of our intellectual and moral system not derived from Greece and Rome, and not belonging to us in common with the Mohammedan nations of the East.

Among these, I do not hesitate to class our whole system of international law. This is so certainly Christian in its origin and character, that it has been declared by the highest authorities, among others by Sir William Scott, not to apply in all respects to Mo-

hammedans. Not less certainly was the idea of a system of international law altogether unknown to the ancient Greeks, although the latter, as far as municipal law is concerned, were eminently a juridical people.

It would be easy to shew, if this were the proper place, that the religious system of the Greeks and Romans—in fact, of all the great states of antiquity—was the chief obstacle to the conception of a great principle of international law. Such a conception, on the contrary, sprang, by a moral necessity, from the new spiritual religion taught in the New Testament. The public law of Christendom, in its utmost comprehension, is but the expansion and application to the affairs of nations of the principle inculcated in our Saviour's sermon on the Mount, "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them."

As in its principle, so in its literary development and culture, the law of nations is the offspring of Christianity. Its first general lessons are found in the Fathers of the Church. Broader generalizations occur in the writings of the scholastic divines, mingled with grave errors, expressed in arid formulas, and buried under a mass of subtle distinctions which repel the modern student. But among the latest of the writers of that class, and just upon the dawn of the Baconian philosophy, we find noble conceptions of public law, expressed in language not to be mended at the present day. In this remark, I have particularly in view the treatise of the jesuit Suarez. In the noble title of his book, I find more significance than in many a wordy tome:—"De Legibus, et Deo Legislatore;" *Of Laws, and God the Lawgiver.* No common mind is seen in that combination of ideas. It compresses a treatise into a title-page. There is no historical illustration, nor much forensic reasoning, in the work of Suarez; but, as you might expect from the title, the religious principle of law, both in the general and all its kinds, is well laid down. To those who deplore the divisions in the great household of Christian faith (and who does not?) it is peculiarly gratifying to see how little there is in this work of a Spanish jesuit from which any serious Protestant would dissent. It is quite a curious fact, first pointed out, I believe, by Mr. Hallam, that the celebrated and constantly quoted passage on the universality of law, at the close of the first book of Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity, is found, substantially, in the work of Suarez.

Grotius, the great founder of our modern science of international law, was a most assiduous student of the Bible. His commentary upon the Old and New Testament, pronounced by Leibnitz the best work of its class, is, as far as I may venture to give an opinion on such a subject, still entitled to that praise. I do not, of course, refer to his exposition of a few contested doctrinal texts, but to the learning, ingenuity and good sense with which he illustrates the whole body of Scripture. He was a profoundly religious man. The foundations of his immortal treatise on the Law of Nations are laid in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament; and the original conception of the work was in the genuine spirit of Christian philanthropy. His golden treatise on the truth of the Christian religion was intended by him as a manual for his adventurous fellow-citizens, then just engaging in the trade with the East; by the aid of which they might scatter the seeds of sacred

truth on distant and heathen shores. That it might be the more easily remembered, he wrote it in verse, and in his native language (the Dutch), at a time when all treatises of this kind were composed in Latin.

I scarce know of a more beautiful illustration of the adaptation of the religion of the Bible to the purposes of active live, than is thus afforded by this model Christian statesman, who, on the one hand, continually fortifies the maxims of the public law by Scripture authority; and, on the other hand, composed a treatise on the evidences of Christianity, to be used by his seafaring countrymen in their voyages to remote regions.

One great end, I may say the chief end, of the law of nations, is to protect weak states against the strong. Just in proportion as that one text of Scripture which I have already quoted—Do unto others as ye would that others should do unto you—is observed by governments in their intercourse with each other, this end is accomplished. It says to the powerful state, "Treat that weak neighbour as *you* would like to be treated if *he* were strong, and *you* were weak." This one rule is worth all Vattel; or, rather, all diplomacy which deserves the name is ultimately resolvable into this maxim.

I remain, dear sir, with great respect, faithfully yours,

EDWARD EVERETT.

INFLUENCE ON SOCIETY OF HARSH NOTIONS OF THE DEITY.

HE (a Siberian philosopher) was of opinion that the imperfections in our institutions were in a great measure owing to the image which even good men, as a means of restraining vice, continually seek to impress, upon the minds of the multitude, concerning the Creator, upon whom, whether taught or untaught, all feel they depend and alone worship. He thought that by so frequently shewing the Deity in his anger, and which was always in a picture so much clearer and more definite in allusion to the next state, than that in which his beneficence was made to appear, the spirits of men were depressed, their hearts hardened, and their disposition subjected to ill-temper and moroseness, from which proceeded half those vices and errors among us, which no regulation of our social institutions could cure. Whereas he thought, that if the instructors of the multitude in all lands, under every system, would shew that the true motives to a good life should be gratitude and not terror, and if they would dwell more upon the rewards of virtue, and upon the delight attending a good conscience, that all men in every condition of society would not only be better, but also more easily governed, and that all their institutions would proportionally improve. *Travels in Siberia, by S. S. Hill, Esq.*

THE LATE REV. W. FIELD.

An elegant marble monument has been placed in the High-Street chapel, Warwick, to the memory of the late Mr. Field, for many years the respected pastor of the congregation assembling in that place of worship; also to Mrs. Field, his beloved partner. It bears the following inscription:

To the Memory of the Reverend William Field, Minister of this Chapel from 1789 to 1848.

He was son of John Field, of Stoke Newington, Esquire, and of Ann Cromwell, a descendant of the Lord Protector, the first who ordained in England, "That none be compelled to conform to the Public Religion by penalties or otherwise."

He was born 10th January, 1768; and died 17th August, 1851.

He was a worthy descendant of a long Puritan Ancestry.

As a Theologian, he was learned. Fully persuaded in his own mind, he would admit persuasion only towards others. All attempts to compel uniformity he abhorred. He knew that the differences of the earnest made the world freer and wider.

As a Teacher, he was vehement for truth, uncompromising, and without reserve.

As a Pastor, he was kind and without pride; caring for poor, rather than rich.

As a Citizen, he strove always to spread knowledge and liberty. His activity was unwearied; his courage indomitable. He ever dared to speak the whole truth. Amid bitter odium he founded the first Sunday-school in this town; and, nearly unaided, and at great personal risk, he maintained it during the Birmingham riots, against a virulence of opposition now inconceivable.

As a Scholar, he was not without repute. His works in aid of "Education were many and excellent, and in advance of their day." He was the friend and Biographer of Dr. Parr; and the Historian of this borough.

As a Father, his chief aim was that his children might be truthful and brave.

Earthly distinctions he too much despised. In all things he looked upwards. In him, servility to man was cast out by loyalty to God.

To the Memory also of Mary Field, his Wife.

She was daughter of William Wilkins, of Bury Fields, in the county of Gloucester, Esq.; was born 7th of December, 1782, and died 2nd October, 1848, having been the mother of fourteen children, eleven of whom survived her.

She was a lady of great talents and energy: admired by all, and widely beloved. She was truly upright, of sincere piety, a most worthy wife, and a most watchful and loving mother.

This stone marks also the reverence of their many children.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE PLURALITY OF WORLDS.

Sir,

Allow me to make a few remarks on what seems to me to be the exceedingly inaccurate reasoning of the essay on the "Plurality of Worlds," mentioned in your last number. The author's reasoning, when reduced to regular form, is as follows. No place is fitted for the habitation of animals which is not like our earth. The stars, the other planets and moons, differ very much from our earth; therefore they are unfit for the habitation of animals.

Now when the argument of the essay is stated in this syllogistic form, it must immediately strike every one that the major premise is utterly destitute and even incapable of proof, and that all presumptive evidence is against it. How can we know what sort of animals the Creator has chosen to make? How can we know that he has not chosen to create infinite varieties, suitable to the various situations in which he has placed them? When we observe the almost countless variety of living creatures upon this earth, and how each is fitted for inhabiting that part of the earth in which it is placed, whether it be desert, mountain, fertile plain, ocean, fresh water, or even the waters in dark caverns, is it not the most natural conclusion that other worlds also present the same infinite variety, and that each is inhabited by living creatures suited by the Great Creator to the situations in which he has placed them?

But not merely is the major premise thus destitute of proof, but the minor also is very inaccurately stated. If the writer of the essay had looked into the first number of Dr. Lardner's new publication begun this year, he would have seen a clear statement of facts relating to the planets, shewing that in many important particulars, and those particularly which seem to render them fit abodes for animals, they resemble our earth. They have all a regular periodical revolution round the sun similar to our year, and a revolution round their own axes similar to that which produces our day and night. They have probably all of them atmospheres, which, by their varying density, may temper the heat which they derive from the sun. The more distant planets are accompanied by numerous satellites, evidently curiously contrived to compensate for the smaller degree of light which they derive from the sun. Mars, the planet which from its situation admits of being most accurately observed, seems to have zones very similar to those of our earth, and a quantity of ice round his poles, which melts during the summer and freezes again during the winter, in a manner very similar to the icy barrier round the poles of our own earth. Now these facts seem to me to lead to a conclusion directly the reverse of that maintained in the essay. They seem to me to furnish strong presumptive evidence for the belief that all the planets, and probably the satellites, the sun and stars too, are inhabited,—not, indeed, by animals exactly similar to those which dwell on this earth, but by living creatures, each suited by the Great Creator of all for the situation in which he has placed it. And surely this belief seems most suitable to the best ideas which we can form of the attributes and character of the Creator. On this ground, then, I remain a firm believer in the infinite plurality of inhabited worlds.

Loughborough, June 4, 1854. T. C. Holland.

ON THE METAPHYSICS OF AN EDINBURGH REVIEWER.

Sir,

In the last number of the Edinburgh Review is a very excellent article on John Locke, the attentive perusal of which I would strongly recommend to all students of the "philosophy of mind." But, p. 432, occurs the following passage: "Locke admits that we have, and cannot *but* have, an idea of substance, of some entity which underlies and supports (it is impossible to avoid using figurative language) the qualities which we cannot conceive to exist separately." And the reviewer obviously maintains this theory. Now it seems to me that such a theory is utterly without any foundation whatever, and that it is itself the cause of many metaphysical and theological errors. The common, and I think accurate, idea of substance includes the qualities of length, breadth and thickness, and solidity or resistance to compression; and all idea of substance as something separate from these qualities, seems to me to be utterly inconceivable. Now this baseless theory seems to be the cause of the whole dispute about the materiality or immateriality of mind. If all that we know of matter be its qualities, and all that we know of mind be its faculties, then the only questions are, Are the faculties of mind the result of the qualities of matter? which I think every person of common sense will at once answer in the negative; and, Are the faculties of the mind inconsistent with the qualities of matter? which I think must also be answered in the negative,—one of the qualities of matter, namely, position with regard to place, being clearly a quality of our minds at least.

This strange theory of a substance different from all the qualities which it is supposed to support, and from which it is supposed to be separable, is the foundation of two great corruptions of Christianity;—Transubstantiation, which supposes that the substance of bread and wine can be changed into the substance of flesh and blood, while all the qualities of the bread and wine remain unchanged; and the doctrine of the Trinity, which supposes that two beings, one independent, the other dependent, can both be of the same substance. Now if it be once clearly understood that the substance of anything is that collection of qualities, attributes or faculties, which is included in the definition of the thing itself, the utter impossibility of either of these doctrines becomes instantly apparent.

In pp. 416, 419, is an admirably clear proof of the being of a God, which, when put into syllogistic form, the surest method of trying the soundness of an argument, is as follows: Everything that has a beginning must have a cause. Our minds, as we know by consciousness, had a beginning: therefore they must have had an adequate cause. Again, assuming the same major proposition, it follows that there must be one Being, himself uncaused and without a beginning, and the cause of all those beings which had a beginning and therefore a cause. And in reply to the objection raised from the difficulty which we feel in forming any idea of Him who had no beginning, I beg to refer to the admirable remarks of the reviewer on the impossibility of forming any other than a negative idea of infinity,—remarks which shew how unavoidably our knowledge must always be limited on all subjects which involve the idea of infinity.

T. C. Holland.

SERVETUS.

Sir,

We are informed by the Christian Reformer of this month, that a proposition has been made in America relative to a memorial in honour of Michael Servetus. We are also informed that this proposition has been referred to a special committee of gentlemen at Worcester, U.S., with a view to the adoption of a memorial.

The memory of Servetus; the great principle with which his honoured name is identified; the presence of the tri-centenary of his martyrdom; the able discourses which have been delivered to commemorate the event; the waspish irritation which these discourses have provoked in the fretful defeated; the demoralizing system of Calvin; the ferocity of Calvin himself,—all concur to demand our commendation on these religious men of America for having, after a *lapse of three hundred years*, taken the initiative in this honourable work.

We feel it is hardly just or creditable that we in England have remained so tardy in giving our testimony; and ought we not to feel a little generous jealousy at the earlier and warmer religious feeling of our friends across the sea?

I venture to hope confidently that, with all those who love religious liberty in England, there will be a hearty cordiality. This is not an Unitarian proposition. I am not an Unitarian. To so regard it exclusively, would be to narrow its import and to damage its success.

The *form* of the English memorial can be decided when an ample sum shall have been subscribed. Whether it shall be a Professorship or a Scholarship, a Statue or a Pillar, a Chapel or some Almshouses, a Painting or a Tablet, in England or in Geneva, may all be left for decision according to the amount of money, the taste of a committee, or any other contingencies.

As gatherings give impulse to principles and sentiments, I would suggest that district or an aggregate meeting should be held at some one given time,—say on the next anniversary of the martyrdom of Servetus, or say on the next Sunday following that day. If an aggregate meeting, at London or Liverpool.

It is a thought for consideration whether, at such a gathering, the commemoration of the Lord's Supper might not be administered, at which each person communicating should present a card, or should be understood to subscribe to the following sentiment—"I believe in but One Supreme God, the Father, and in Jesus Christ, whom he hath sent."

These thoughts are offered as a basis only for improved suggestions.

Pentonville, May 23, 1854. J. S. H.

CAUSE OF LORD HERBERT'S SCEPTICISM.

The assertion that "the understanding is an insufficient source of knowledge in divine things" (which in one sense is doubtless true), has been sometimes strangely misapplied. It was the adoption of this idea which led Lord Herbert of Cherbury to resort to a supposed instinct, or peculiar consciousness, as the ground of religious belief, and thus to reject a positive revelation altogether.—*Edinburgh Review.*

CRITICAL NOTICES.

Examination of Objections made to Unitarianism by the Rev. J. C. Miller, M.A., in his Sermon preached in St. Martin's Church, Birmingham, on Sunday, April 2, 1854, *and entitled, "The Working Man rejecting Unitarianism:" in Four Lectures, delivered in the Old Meeting-house, Birmingham, on Sundays, April* 30, *May* 7, 14, *and* 21, 1854. By Samuel Bache and Charles Clarke: and published by Request. 8vo. Pp. 72. London—Whitfield.

The circumstances which led to this publication are soon told. On the first Sunday in April, Mr. Miller, in a series of discourses addressed to working men, warned them against what he considers the dangerous and fatal errors of Unitarianism. He charged it with an inadequate representation of the enormity of sin, with depriving man of a Saviour, and with preventing a just appreciation and Christian reception of the death of Christ. He also ascribed the Unitarian "heresy" to pride of intellect and denial of mystery. The respected ministers of the New and Old meeting-houses in Birmingham immediately addressed a public letter to Mr. Miller, informing him of their intention to examine in some little detail, in a series of discourses, his allegations and arguments. The lectures were delivered to crowded and deeply-interested audiences on the last Sunday in April and the three first Sunday evenings in May. They are now, at the united request of the Committees of the Old and New meeting-house congregations, published, in the hope that the strong impression which they made when delivered in favour of a simple, scriptural and rational faith, will be communicated to a still wider circle of persons.

The first lecture, by Mr. Bache, ably prepares the way for the discussion of the great themes, by detailing the views and feelings with which inquiry after religious truth should be undertaken and pursued, and, with a clearness and force of reasoning which must have deeply impressed the intelligent working men of Birmingham, he shews that Unitarianism is the result neither of pride of intellect nor of rejection of mystery.

In the second lecture, Mr. Clarke proceeds to consider the kind of evidence by which the doctrine of the Trinity is attempted to be proved, and shews that belief in the Godhead of Christ and of the Holy Ghost is not essential to salvation. We have read this able discourse with unmingled pleasure, and especially that portion of it in which Mr. Clarke vindicates the Unitarian body from the charge of rejecting "the written word of God." He truly says,

> "The ministers and lay members of our denomination are in the habit of using the Scriptures with reverence and thankfulness. In our estimation, the Bible is the greatest and the best of books. In religious matters it is our sole authority, besides that Infinite and Eternal Spirit whose temple is the human heart."—P. 25.

In the third lecture, Mr. Bache discusses, with his habitual clearness and strength, the true conditions of Christian salvation. He examines the doctrine which imputes sacrificial efficacy to the death of Christ, and shews, not merely that Unitarianism is not the result of an inadequate discernment or conviction of sin, but that portions of the orthodox system are most dangerous to Christian morals.

Mr. Clarke winds up the subject in the fourth and last lecture, by exhibiting Unitarianism in its relation to other forms of Christian belief, as opposed to assumed infallibility, and as the genuine result of the true principles of Protestantism. Agreeing with him as we do in his estimate of the *consistency* and *truthfulness* of the founders of the Milton Club, we question the good taste of bringing such a miserably insignificant affair as this misnamed London Club of Independents, &c., into the discussion in the pulpit of the great subject he had in hand.

We are not aware whether the rector of St. Martin's has attempted any rejoinder to these masterly replies to his lecture. He has probably by this time discovered his mistake, and learnt that a greater disservice can scarcely be done to the cause of orthodoxy than by an unreserved attack on Unitarianism. We believe that the angry effusions which indiscreet clergymen are accustomed to deliver on Trinity Sunday, have made many Churchmen, even against their will, Unitarians. And certainly the public denunciations of men like the thirteen clergymen of Liverpool, Mr. Stowell at Bristol and Manchester, and Mr. Miller at Birmingham, have rendered unintended service to scripture truth, by exciting inquiry, and by rousing from its accustomed apathy the popular mind, and especially by calling into action that stubborn English sense of justice which insists on hearing both sides. Mr. Bache and Mr. Clarke have proved themselves both able and prudent defenders of the Unitarian faith. It is our earnest desire that their lectures may be widely circulated. They are well calculated both to remove prejudice from the minds of "orthodox" believers, and to confirm the faith of Unitarians. Though the track of the Trinitarian controversy may be supposed to be beaten and familiar, it will be found that in these lectures important conclusions are confirmed by new illustrations. As an example of this, we select Mr. Bache's ingenious mode of turning back upon his opponent the charge of "pride of intellect," of subjection to "carnal reason," and of "rejection of mystery."

"Many of you are, no doubt, well aware that somewhere about three hundred years ago (A. D. 1530), a great revolution was made in the science of Astronomy by the Polish philosopher Nicholas Copernicus, who plainly proved, what has ever since been universally believed in this Western part of the world, that the sun and not the earth is the centre of our system; whereas before his time the universal belief on this subject had been in accordance with the theory of the philosopher Ptolemy, that the earth is the centre, and that the sun and all the other heavenly bodies revolve continually round it. This Ptolemaic system of astronomy, I repeat, was received wherever astronomy was studied at all, all the world over, prior to the correction of it some three hundred years ago by Nicholas Copernicus. Among the places in which the Ptolemaic system was thus received were the cities of our Eastern empire; and, accordingly, the late learned and pious Bishop Heber tells us, in one of his missionary publications (*Journey through Upper India*, 4to, vol. i. p. 295-6), that at the Brahminical College in Benares he found this erroneous system of astronomy still regularly taught, it being the *established* system in this department of science, from which the teachers and professors of it, therefore, thought it inexpedient to depart. Now what I affirm is, that if there be such a thing as 'pride of intellect,' as in connexion with the results of its exercise, I believe there is,—if there be such a thing as subjection to 'carnal reason,' we have here an example of it. What did these Brahminical professors of astronomy? *This* is what they did. They had received by tradition from their fathers certain conclusions regarding the heavenly bodies, which

they were determined at all events to maintain. These conclusions appeared just and right enough to the philosopher Ptolemy (A. D. 150) who first announced them, because, reasoning from the only facts with which he was conversant, he could hardly arrive at any other. There was no *pride* of reason, therefore, in him in maintaining them. But by the inventions and labours of Galileo and the subsequent discoveries of Copernicus, other facts had been brought to light which could not possibly be reconciled with such conclusions, which went altogether to overthrow them. What shall we say of the men who, in spite of these facts, still maintained the conclusions,—the mere inferences, and mistaken inferences too, of those who had gone before them? Must we not say that they exalted the results of reason, in connexion with imperfect and erroneous conceptions, above the well-ascertained facts of nature and providence? And must we not, therefore, say, that if there be such a thing as 'pride of reason' anywhere, it must surely be here?—*not* in the philosophers who, by further inquiry and investigation, have exploded once popular errors, but in the men who have embalmed those errors in a delusive and lifeless creed, and still insist on maintaining them. Is not this the just and appropriate application of the censure, my brethren?

"Now is there any science among us in this country, and in these days, which bears the same character of unimproved and unimprovable stagnation, in consequence of being arbitrarily *fixed* and *established*, as the science of astronomy had, and perhaps still has, at Benares? I know of one, and of one only: that is, *theology*, or the science of religion. All other sciences, thank God! have burst their thraldom and are free; *this* will be free in time: at present, however, it is bound and fast. Accordingly Christians, who recognise this arbitrary authority among us, are forced to express their Christian belief, and this, too, in the very sanctuary itself and in the solemn services of divine worship, in terms which are nowhere to be found in Scripture itself, which very many of them freely allow have never been derived from Scripture, but from tradition and the fathers, and which authentic history shows us to have been originally suggested by the speculations of Eastern philosophy, against which many persons think that St. John, in the introduction to his Gospel, enters his emphatic protest, and which really form no part whatever of the rational, and practical, and devotional religion of Jesus. Now, if 'pride of intellect' can be fairly alleged against any form of Christian profession, must it not rather be against that form which *embodies* these vain and antiquated speculations than against that which *repudiates* them? Even on the admission that the profession itself *can* be shown to be in accordance with the Scriptures (which I presume that the Rector of St. Martin's at least would maintain, and which it is not my business in this lecture to discuss), does it savour nothing of 'pride of intellect' to substitute it, *as a profession*, for the plain and solemn declarations of the Bible itself, and to wrap up the living convictions (if such they be) of living souls in our own times in the antiquated and much-disputed phraseology of confessors in ages that are past?"—Pp. 16—18.

A Sunday Reading-Book for Schools and Families. Edited by Charles L. Corkran. Published by the Sunday-School Association. Pp. 304. London—Whitfield. 1854.

We accept with warm feelings of gratitude this beautiful compilation, which Sunday-school teachers and religious parents will find full of instructive and suggestive lessons,—of prose rich in moral truth, and of poetry abounding with the "thoughts that breathe and words that burn." Mr. Corkran has not followed, in his selection of lessons, any beaten or sectarian track, but has moved, under the guidance of a cultivated mind and a poetic taste, amongst Protestant and Catholic, Or-

thodox and Heterodox, Puritan and Latitudinarian writers. Here and there we have stumbled upon a passage which we should scarcely like to undertake to explain to an intelligent upper-class lad; but it is not possible to select from such writers as Coleridge, Martineau and William Law, passages entirely free from obscurity. In one respect the volume deserves unqualified praise: it inculcates a pure, noble and generous morality, and aims equally at the instruction of the understanding and the enlargement of the heart.

The Christian Doctrine of Prayer. An Essay. By James Freeman Clarke. Boston—published by Crosby and Co., for the Executive Committee of the American Unitarian Association. 1854.

The subject of Prayer is difficult or easy, according to the way in which it is approached. Entered upon metaphysically, we at once encounter the difficulties of the question of liberty and necessity, of man's free-will and God's omniscience,—difficulties which have hitherto baffled the profoundest and subtlest human intellects. Approached scripturally and practically, the subject of prayer is simple, and opens to the human mind the most delightful views respecting God and man.

In this little treatise, Mr. Clarke has proposed to himself the high task of elucidating the subject of prayer in both its metaphysical and practical bearings, and "to shew how Divine Grace can be paired with Human Freedom, and Love be at one with Law." We cannot honestly congratulate him on the success of the metaphysical portions of his essay. He states the difficulties fairly enough, but he does little to remove them. He cuts the Gordian knot, which he cannot untie. Had Mr. Clarke confined himself to the scriptural and practical aspect of his subject, we believe his work would have been an unmixedly valuable contribution to the literature of devotion and practical religion. We select as a specimen of our author's style a passage in which Mr. Clarke is combatting transcendental objections to prayer:

"There is also a spiritual philosophy, which by its view of God and of man tends to a distrust in the efficacy of Prayer. Its view of God tends to Pantheism, its view of man to Stoicism. It rejects from its idea of God the element of personality, and regards him rather as essential Being and the most abstract Spirit, than as a personal Father. It fears to degrade God by making him too much like ourselves, and shrinks from direct communion with him, as implying anthropomorphism. It dreads lest the pure and spiritual idea of God should be degraded by being mixed up with low desires and earthly cares. Its worship is adoration and submission, rather than supplication; and its view of man is also opposed to any expectation of an answer to Prayer. Man, according to this philosophy, stands in the midst of the mighty and relentless forces of Nature, to make himself strong by patience, resolution and unflinching fortitude. The wheels of Nature thunder along their fixed path from century to century, and he who falls on them is broken, while him *(he)* whom they strike down is ground to powder. It is of no use to ask for mercy, for Nature gives no quarter. Her face, full of stony beauty, looks out relentless, with features unchanging as those of the Egyptian Sphinx. Man can only triumph over Fate by knowing it and bearing it. When he has made up his mind to acquiesce in events as they come, in things as they are, he has secured the highest moral triumph. It is easy to see how inevitably such a view of God, and such a theory of man and of human life, must tend to check all earnest prayer.

"In opposition to this view of life, so beautiful but so cold, we present the

attitude assumed by Jesus toward God and toward life. He who said to the woman of Samaria, 'God is Spirit,' also taught his disciples to say, 'Our Father.' He who made it the centre of all supplication to pray that God's will should be done on earth as in heaven, taught us in the next petition to ask for our daily bread. He who demanded, in view of the great emergencies and risks of life, a readiness for entire self-renunciation as the first condition of discipleship, nevertheless encouraged his followers to bring every desire of their heart before God. As the entrance-fee into his school, he demanded that they should be ready to hate father and mother, to give all their wealth away, to leave everything and to take up their cross. But having been found equal to this test, he laid on them no ascetic discipline, took them not away from the common scenes of life, and lived with them in cheerful communion with God and man. God was to him always the nearest friend; and life was no fatal web, but a scene where, amid the steady operation of divine laws, there was still the freest scope for divine and human freedom. We conceive that it is only necessary to compare these two views of God and Nature, to see how much more large and human that of Christ is than the spiritual Stoicism we have been considering."—Pp. 102—104.

We are informed that Mr. Clarke's essay has had a wide circulation amongst the professedly "orthodox" of America. The mode in which he discusses, when treating of the "object of prayer" and the "Holy Spirit," the controversial portions of his subject, is highly creditable to his candour. While clearly stating the Unitarian doctrine, as to the object of worship and the operations of the Holy Spirit, he does not shrink from an equally fair statement of "orthodox" objections. His exposure of "orthodox" inconsistencies, in respect to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, is forcible, and cannot but tend to the promotion of better and more scriptural views on the subject.

The Church of the Free-born. A Discourse, preached on Wednesday, June 7, 1854, before the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, at its Twenty-ninth Anniversary Meeting, held in the New Gravel-Pit Chapel, Hackney. By Edward Higginson, Minister of Westgate Chapel, Wakefield. To which is prefixed, the Prayer offered in the Introductory Service by the Rev. J. J. Tayler, B.A., Principal of Manchester New College, London. 8vo. Pp. 44. Whitfield.

Our readers would be able to form some idea of the quality of this discourse from the outline of it which appeared in our last No., pp. 428, 429. With that, however, we trust not any of them will be satisfied. Of the many sermons which have come under our notice, we hardly remember one that appeared to us more appropriate to the occasion, or the subjects of which were treated with greater skill. Both about the thought with which it teems, and the language in which that thought is expressed, there are a freshness and vigour which, even in the reading, are quite exhilirating. In its delivery from the pulpit, the preacher could not fail to make a deep impression on his hearers, among whom we should wonder indeed, whatever the temperature of the place, if a single drowsy one were to be found. If good writing consist in "right words in right places," we think in this able production Mr. Higginson proves that he has mastered the art most completely. Noble, manly utterances, which find their way direct to the head and the heart, come clothed in a style at once easy, attractive and pungent. So strong is our own impression of the excellence of this sermon, that we are ex-

cordingly desirous it should get into the hands of every Unitarian. Few, we think, could read it without becoming more deeply impressed with the value of the principles they profess, and inspired with increased earnestness to extend the knowledge of them to others.

Were we to quote all the striking passages, we should extract the larger portion of the sermon. One paragraph will, perhaps, suffice to justify the high opinion we have expressed. It is on a feature of our faith which forms at once its glory and, for sectarian purposes, its weakness. Why should I, argue not a few timid people, who may have occasional misgivings as to the soundness of views they at present profess—why should I renounce the opinions in which I have been educated, and which are believed by the great body of professing Christians, and adopt those of a mere handful, whom all other sects unite in denouncing, when, according to your own account, I am, as regards the future, in as *safe* a state with my wrong views, as I should be with your right ones? The logic of this is worthy of its morality; but, on such minds, with what a quickening power would a little counter threatening and damnation fall!

"Our religious freedom is mainly due to our intire practical renunciation of that specific idea or feeling, which forms at once the sting and the self-torture of what is called Orthodoxy. We are spiritually free, because we have risen above the wretched dogma of merit as attaching, or salvation (without merit) as accruing, to particular opinions rather than to other opinions held with equal sincerity and adorned with like virtues. Practically, if not theoretically too, as taught by the conduct of our Presbyterian forefathers, if not also convinced by our own reflections, we understand the springs of opinion in the human mind too well to think ourselves in a safer spiritual state than conscientious Trinitarians. Our distinctive theology includes not religious opinions only, but more prominently *the philosophy of opinions*. It goes far deeper than to the mere adoption of a belief in the Divine Unity, as opposed to a belief in a Divine Trinity. If to this our belief, with is attendant doctrines, we devoutly added (as why should we not?—let the Trinitarian reflect and answer) the anathema that 'unless a man keep it whole and undefiled, he shall without doubt perish everlastingly,' Unitarianism, instead of being freedom and blessing, would be the withering thing that Athanasian Trinitarianism now is. And if the doctrine of the Trinity and its logically connected views were simply taught as intellectually true, without the arrogant instilment of a feeling or opinion that there is spiritual safety in holding them and spiritual danger in denying them, in that case Trinitarian nonconformity would be as worthy of the free-born Christian who believed it as Unitarianism. For my part, I know not why Trinitarianism might not be thus propounded; but the simple fact is, that it never is so represented, unless in occasional whispers which the Trinitarian world immediately hushes. The Trinitarian belief uniformly is (in all its authorized formularies, its preaching and its discussions) connected with more or less of this *moral intimidation*;—Unitarianism never is in any degree. And the real source of our freedom of heart-faith is not simply our Unitarian opinions, but our deeper conviction as to the real nature and value, the influence and the merits, of opinions, and of the processes by which they are formed and the spirit in which they are held. So, on the other hand, that which, in Orthodoxy, moves our moral disapprobation, is not, and never can be, the belief in a Trinity, as an opinion conscientiously held by any; but that poor yet arrogant notion, however conscientiously held, that that belief can earn a man Heaven's favour, or its want peril another man's salvation. By Orthodoxy we understand, not Trinitarianism nor any *ism* in itself, but any *ism* that arms itself with *spiritual pains and penalties*. From all such fears in our own

souls we are free. We are free from the sin or the sorrow (whichever it might be) of threatening or condemning others; and from the sore anguish of doubting whether the good, the pure, the upright, the intelligent and sincere among our fellow-men and fellow-christians, can be saved as well as we by the mercies of the Father of us all! We are spared the moral perplexity, the confusion and the misery of doubting whether the same things which are right on earth are so in heaven, and whether conscience, which is at any rate our best guide, be really a light from God, or a glare of temptation to make us sin against the faith!"—Pp. 24—26.

Attached to the Sermon is the appropriate Prayer delivered in the introductory service by the Rev. John James Tayler, characterized by all the beauty of thought and diction which is stamped on whatever proceeds from his graceful pen.

A Sermon delivered at the Opening of the Unitarian Chapel, Macquarie Street, Sydney, November 6th, 1853. By the Rev. G. H. Stanley, B.A. Published by Request. Sydney—Sands and Kenny, George Street. 1853.

It is with deep interest that we contemplate the erection of Unitarian churches at Sydney, Melbourne and San Francisco. In this good work our American brethren are our coadjutors. They feel equally with ourselves, that where we plant our colonies, and transmit our language, laws and civil institutions, we ought also to strive to plant pure Christianity. Whether our colonies shall become a help or a burthen, an ornament or a disgrace, depends largely on the moral principles of the colonists. Without the sanctions of religion, the security of good morals is slight indeed. We trust that in these new regions Unitarianism will be presented less in its controversial than in its moral and spiritual application. There must of course be no concealment or holding back of the positive doctrines of Unitarianism, which are in our view the pure doctrines of Christianity. But let this be done in no spirit of mere antagonism to existing forms of Christian doctrine. Mr. Stanley's discourse gives good promise that, in Sydney at least, Unitarianism will be presented to the public mind in its broader principles, and will be proclaimed in a truly Christian and catholic spirit.

Protestantism in Paris: a Series of Discourses. Translated from the French of A. Coquerel. Pp. 195. Boston—Crosby, Nichols and Co. 1854.

This little volume contains six sermons on the subjects of, 1, The Second Death; 2, Eternal Punishment; 3, The Faith of Thomas, an Easter sermon; 4, Christianity a Great Joy, a Christmas sermon; 5, St. Paul the Thirteenth Apostle; 6, The Two Promises to Piety (1 Tim. iv. 8).

The discourses are both pious and rational, uniformly scriptural, and sometimes eloquent. They are calculated to inspire unmixed respect for the Protestant teaching of M. Coquerel in Paris, and to excite the best hopes for the diffusion of true evangelical principles in France. Of the author the American translator thus speaks in the Preface:

"Athanase Coquerel, the author of the following discourses, may well be selected as the exponent of Protestantism in Paris, occupying as he does so prominent a position in the Reformed Church of France. M. Coquerel is a preacher, whose great eloquence has earned for him, in the course of his more than thirty years' ministry, a corresponding reputation and influence. As a

writer, he is perhaps still more widely known, being the author of a book called Experimental Christianity, a discussion of the fundamental doctrines of our religion, based upon a critical examination of the original texts; of a Reply to 'The Life of Jesus' by Strauss; of two letters on the Hieroglyphic System of Champollion, considered in relation to the Sacred Writings; and of a variety of other works. Finally, he has been before the public as a member of the last Assembly of France, previous to the *coup d'état* of December 2nd. He is therefore a man whose opinions, both for themselves and for the extent of their influence over the minds of others, are entitled to consideration."

With what pictorial grace and moral power M. Coquerel handles his topics, and how well he is represented by his translator, our readers may learn from a passage extracted from the first of the six discourses, on *the Second Death:*

"The expression of the text has perhaps caused you sufficient surprise to make it proper to describe the setting in which the sacred poet has placed it, and to admire the art with which he brings it out. It is found only in the Apocalypse; it appears there three times. It is in harmony with this style, so full of imagery, the obscurities of which have so much exercised the inventive spirit of commentators. This book, my brethren, where has been obstinately sought the delineation of the future, instead of seeing in it simply the emblems of the past,—and imaginary Jerusalems, Babylons and Romes, instead of finding there again those of antiquity,—this book opens with seven epistles, addressed to the seven principal churches of Asia Minor. The text terminates the epistle to the church of Smyrna. This famous city, situated at the head of the Mediterranean Sea, received, so to say, all its waves, its merchandise, riches, errors and vices; it was one of those immense marts where Europe and Africa, the whole Roman Empire, came to pour out their treasures in exchange for the thousand products, always so much desired, of the climates and industry of the East. Thus Smyrna, raising itself always from its disasters, was still in the early ages of the church filled with riches and philosophy, with pleasure and corruption. The Christian Church flourished there, but small in numbers, and recruited as yet only among the poor and humble. The Synagogue, on the contrary, counted many rich and eminent families, who gave—as everywhere else—the signal for persecution against the Christians. In order to judge of the ardor and power of this hate, it suffices to recall (whatever uncertainty may be thrown over these comparisons by our ignorance of the epoch when the Apocalypse was composed) that the Synagogue had sufficient influence to have condemned to the stake a disciple of St. John, Polycarpus, who is believed to have been the first pastor of Smyrna, the author of a remarkable letter addressed to the believers of Philippi; and such was the rage of the executioners of the martyr, that they did not permit his disciples to save his body from the flames, into which they threw it again with their hands. The letter that the author of the Apocalypse writes to the Smyrniotes, has for *(its?)* object to sustain their courage and their faith against the persecutions of which he predicts to them the short duration, and he terminates it by this solemn declaration: '*Let him that hath ears hearken to what the Spirit saith to the churches. He that overcometh,*'—he who shall not fly nor succumb in the struggle with the enemies of the faith,—'*shall not,*' whatever may happen, '*suffer from the second death.*' * * * Here I might pause to ask you if there would be any injustice in finding some resemblance between the ancient Ionian city—so proud of its commerce, of its opulence, its civilization—and the city in whose midst rises this pulpit, from whence I have just re-echoed, after so many centuries, the words of St. John, to raise before your eyes the solemn image of the second death, and say again to you—to you who have also a struggle to maintain—that you can obtain the same victory. Everything which makes the grandeur,

the wealth, the confidence of the world, is possessed by our city, even to the hundred-fold of ancient Smyrna; and as for purity of manners, holiness of faith, assiduity of worship....But this would be to accumulate comparisons too much; I promised you one between the two deaths; for the parallel between the two cities, I resign you to your consciences, and leave to you the care of making it."—Pp. 7—11.

The Quarterly Review, No. CLXXXIX., June, 1854.

The Quarterly opens with a very lively and not ungenial sketch of the House of Commons, in relation both to the building, the modes of conducting its business, and the personal and intellectual characteristics of the leading Members. As to the House itself, the reviewer alludes happily both to its defects and its excellences:

"Those who have lost themselves in Sir Charles Barry's labyrinths,

> 'Whose wandering ways and many a winding fold
> Involve the weary feet without redress,
> In a round error, which denies recess,'—

Who have shivered in his lofty chambers, and murmured at the early darkness of his cells, have often wished that the multifold magnificence of the New Palace had been exchanged for the convenience and comfort of a modern structure, where the feudal system had been less thought of than easy communication and practical accommodation. On the other hand, those whom Lord Willoughby d'Eresby's cards have admitted to the House of Lords on the day when her Majesty attends to open or close the sitting, and who have witnessed the splendid and significant spectacle which is afforded upon such an occasion, warmly contend that no architectural arrangement could offer so fit a sitting for the scene as the gilded and painted roof, the coloured windows gleaming with royal effigies, the illuminated heraldry, and the alternating glow and sparkle of that glittering chamber."

The sketches of the principal speakers are slight in execution, but happy and prevailingly fair. Here are the remarks on Palmerston, D'Israeli and Gladstone:

"Lord Palmerston does not affect eloquence, but usually speaks in a frank English manner, the franker that he frequently hesitates over a word, making no secret of the fact that he wishes to select the best. His action is energetic, even in giving a brief explanation. His long experience of business and of the House, combined with his own keen insight into character, tell him at a glance what manner of man his antagonist is, and in what way it would be acceptable to the House to have him treated. Though he is personally fearless, and never hesitates to close when the fight demands a grapple, it is evidently pleasanter to Lord Palmerston merely to exchange a few knightly blows with a worthy assailant, and then to charge upon the field after the manner of one of the Froissart heroes, so much admired by John Graham of Claverhouse. Of Mr. Disraeli's masterly, passionless, finished delivery, we have already spoken. Like the warrior to whom Norna chants her witch-song, seldom

> 'Lies he still, through sloth or fear,
> When point and edge are glittering near.'

An ever ready speaker, his premeditated orations,—that is to say, those over which he has had some time, no matter how short, to ponder,—are nevertheless infinitely better than those prompted by the exigency of the moment. He will sometimes, from this cause, reply better to the earlier part of an antagonist's argument than to its close; and his own peroration is seldom so effective, as what in dramatic language may be called the crisis of his speech. Unprepared, he has a tendency to verbiage, and to a repetition of the same

idea, without a sufficient variety of treatment: prepared, and not a blow misses, not a platitude irritates, not a sarcasm is impeded by a weakening phrase. The arrow, stripped of all plumage except that which aids and steadies its flight, strikes within a hair's breadth of the archer's aim;—whether it finds the joint of the harness, or shivers on the shield, is occasionally matter of opinion; but that it often wounds deeply, would seem to be proved by the exceeding ferocity with which, out of the House, Mr. Disraeli is assailed. In the House, it is rare for any one but Mr. Gladstone to meddle with him. * * * Mr. Gladstone is the most polished speaker in the House of Commons. His verbal resources are as remarkable as his management of them, and his manner is invariably that of a gentleman. He is charged with 'subtlety' by coarser minds; but we fancy that the English intellect, which is not distinguished for its analytical power, treats the subject in a somewhat jumbling fashion. Mr. Gladstone inclines to the Tractarian party. Tractarians are no better than Jesuits. Jesuits are proverbially subtle; and therefore, when Mr. Gladstone is defining very elaborately the difference between long annuities and deferred annuities, he is talking Jesuitically. We believe that Mr. Gladstone would be a more popular orator if he would be less explicit; but while he exhausts the subject, he sometimes exhausts the listener. His refined and scholarly periods, the creation of the moment, but as elegantly balanced and as keenly pointed as if they had been written and studied, are always marvels of fluency, and often specimens of eloquence."

The second article of the Review is Dean Milman's History of Latin Christianity, which is pronounced to be "the most important work on ecclesiastical history that the English language has produced." After alluding to the works of other ecclesiastical historians, the reviewer proceeds:

"But none of these can vie, in the union of learning and ability and extent, with that which is now before us. With a poetic temperament, of which the first fire glowed in those striking passages of lyrical and dramatic poetry by which he won his earliest fame, Dean Milman has combined an amount of industry and experience, which he has steadily applied to the subject of which these three, we trust we may add, without presumptuous anticipation, these six volumes are the crowning result."

The reviewer chiefly occupies himself with an attempt to explain what Latin Christianity is, and what are its claims on the respectful treatment even of those who have most widely departed from many of its doctrines. There follow articles on the Drama, Classical Dictionaries, and the Electric Telegraph.

The sixth article is on Christianity in Milanesia and New Zealand. With Christianity it appears that the different sects have also imported some of the sectarian animosity too habitual to Christian civilized countries. "The disputes between 'Weteri, Haha and Pikopo,' Wesley, Church and Bishop, i.e. Romanists, are carried on with native volubility throughout the length and breadth of the land." The reviewer remarks that this is "a fact so melancholy as almost to tempt the ordinary reader to lay down the volumes of missionary records in despair;" and adds, "with whomsoever the fault may be, the originators and fosterers of such feuds seem to us *worse enemies to religion than many to whom ecclesiastical nomenclature awards the title of schismatics.*" The article closes with an enthusiastic tribute of praise to the late Governor of New Zealand:

"Sir George Grey has left his Government, perhaps not to return. He has left it escorted by the prayers and blessings of thousands, whom he has seen raised, mainly through his own judgment and perseverance, from barbarism

to civilization. No man in our day, perhaps in any day, has accomplished such a task. And yet it is not to the governor that these simple and cordial people bring the homage of their attachment, but to the man. It is the charm of sympathy which has won them—the charm of his own deep and somewhat enthusiastic affection for the race which he knows so well and has served so truly."

There follows an able article on Queen Elizabeth and her favourites, chiefly devoted to her private and personal character. The portrait is anything but pleasing; e.g.,

"Elizabeth was coarse and savage in her personal tastes; we should almost think beyond the standard of her time, though from her capacity she might be fairly expected to have risen above it. We are told that she never mentioned the name of God without a marked pause and the addition of the epithet Creator; but there must be an implied exception of those cases in which the name was employed as the vehicle of the frightful oaths in which she constantly indulged. It was the vice of the age, but a vice from which a woman, a Queen and such a Queen, might have been reasonably expected to be free; a vice which we can hardly conceive attaching to her sister, or to her sister's victim. The same may be said of the barbarous nature of her favorite diversions. The reign of a maiden Queen might well have been selected as the period to wipe out the national disgrace, that the pleasures of Englishmen invariably involved pain to some living creature. But Elizabeth delighted in bull-baitings and bear-baitings beyond all recorded example; even the harmless ape was called upon to contribute by its sufferings to the royal diversion. In the nobler sports of the field, the skill and the excitement seem to have been less prized than the actual butchery; the stag, hunted down by man and beast, was brought to receive its death-wound from a hand which might more gracefully have been raised to command its deliverance. On some occasions she strangely mingled devotion and cruelty, while she ransacked the frozen zone to find objects for her inhuman pastime. She went to hear a sermon at St. Mary's Spital, two white bears following in a cart; we need not say for what purpose they were destined at the conclusion of the discourse. Did the Church of England contain a divine courageous enough to have filled up the interval with an exhortation from the text—'The righteous man regardeth the life of his beast, but the tender mercies of the wicked are cruel'? From the inferior animals, the step was in those days counted but small to the inferior types of the human race. Here Elizabeth has the additional guilt, not merely of continuing but of commencing iniquity. In her reign and under her auspices, England became first infected with the guilt of the slave-trade. Such were the many failings which disfigured the fair fame of 'Elizabeth, by the grace of God, Queen of England, France and Ireland; Defender of the true ancient and catholic Faith; most worthy Empress from the Orcade Isles to the Pyrenee.'"

The No., the best we have had for a long time from the Quarterly, closes with an article on the War and Lord Lyndhurst's recent remarkable speech.

Religion and Science: a Plea for Unitarianism. By John Gordon. 12mo. Pp. 24. Whitfield.

This is a reprint of the able article, under the above title, which appeared in our last No. In the popular form which it now bears, we cordially recommend it to our Tract Societies, through whose agency we hope it will obtain a wide circulation. Such effective missionaries of our faith might be usefully employed to a much greater extent than they are.

INTELLIGENCE.

EASTERN UNITARIAN CHRISTIAN SOCIETY.

The forty-first anniversary of this Society was held at Framlingham, Suffolk, on Thursday, June 29th. The service was introduced by the Revds. H. Squire, of Yarmouth, and S. F. Macdonald, of Diss; and a most interesting and impressive discourse was delivered by the Rev. Samuel Martin, of Trowbridge, from the words, "Let the whole earth be filled with his glory" (Ps. lxxii. 19). The preacher first shewed what the glory of the Lord properly consisted in,—namely, in the conversion of men from ignorance and sin, and the promotion of pure, undefiled religion throughout the world; secondly, he referred to the grounds upon which we may anticipate the fulfilment of this divine purpose; and, thirdly, he pointed out the obligations which specially rest upon us to labour vigorously and perseveringly in God's vineyard. The entire discourse was marked by Mr. Martin's characteristic earnestness, truthfulness and simplicity.

After service, the annual meeting of the Society was held in the chapel, when the Rev. H. Knott, of Ipswich, presided, and the report of the Committee was read by the Secretary. The various churches of the district were reported in a healthy condition; the pulpit at Framlingham having been recently filled by the Rev. Thomas Cooper, late of Warminster, and that at Bury St. Edmunds about to be supplied by the Rev. Mr. Newell.

J. W. Dowson, Esq., who had acted as Secretary for the last twenty years, thought it right to explain that his views had lately undergone some modification, and that he felt a growing sympathy with the Free Christian movement. The members of the Society who were present, however, did not think there was anything in his statement adverse to its objects and principles, and therefore unanimously re-appointed Mr. Dowson to the office of Secretary.

At three o'clock, a party of nearly fifty ladies and gentlemen assembled at the Crown and Anchor inn to partake of a cold collation. The Rev. Henry Squire was called to the chair, and discharged its duties in a very effective manner. He would introduce the somewhat unusual toast of "Church and State"—in which, however, he was persuaded all would join; for by the first he meant the true and universal Church of Christ; and by the second, the liberty and prosperity of the people who constitute the State. He then gave the "Army and Navy," and hoped that their exertions would speedily secure for us an honourable and permanent peace.

The Rev. S. Martin, the preacher of the day, responded to the hearty thanks presented to him for his services. He declared that he felt a lively interest in such association meetings as the present, which are calculated to awaken pleasant and brotherly feelings, to drive away indifference and sloth, and strengthen our union as Christians. Every man and woman should feel that they have got some work to do in helping forward Christ's kingdom, and where there is an earnest will, the way is always found. We must not despise the day of small things; we were few in number, but almost everything great and good had arisen from small bands of fervid souls working together; we ought to remember, too, that the fewer men, the greater share of honour to each. Difficulties are not to be magnified, but met and overcome by patient perseverance. The word of God to Moses, when he was hemmed in by the mountains on each side, the Red Sea before and the Egyptians behind, was to "go forward." So must every Christian "go forward" with unwavering faith, seeking first to possess the good himself, and then communicate it to his brethren. Our cause is good, but we are not sufficiently anxious to improve our privileges. If we find that other sects are making greater progress than ourselves, we must strive to out-preach, out-pray, out-work, and above all, out-*live* them. Perhaps we are somewhat impatient of results; we must be content to sow diligently and wait; more good is often done than is apparent. Mr. Martin here gave several most interesting anecdotes of his own ministerial experience, shewing the happy, though often distant, results of faithful labour in the cause of Christ; and concluded by exhorting all to greater activity, more union amongst ministers and people, and more love to God and man.

The Rev. Thomas Cooper, recently settled at Framlingham, spoke of the great improvement which had taken place in that, his native town, since he left it forty years ago. He found the Wesleyan reformers, the Independents and others, far more liberal and friendly. He entertained hopes of a revival of true religion; he wished to see greater union among Christians, and earnestly prayed that all might hold the faith in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace, and in righteousness of life.

The Rev. H. Knott expressed the pleasure which he had derived from his recent attendance at the annual meetings in London; but he owned that these provincial gatherings were more to his taste, where, beneath a purer sky and surrounded by the beauties of nature, old and well-tried friends meet to worship together, and to help and encourage each other in their arduous work. He referred in agreeable terms to Mr. Martin's visit, and hoped they would all derive benefit from it. Looking to the general state of society, there was no doubt that the stream of thought was setting in the direction of a more liberal and reasonable theology; the orthodox sects were decidedly turning towards us, and perhaps it would not be amiss if we turned somewhat towards them. He believed this could be done without in the slightest degree compromising our principles; he would be the last man to counsel any departure from sincerity, any trifling with conscience,—but our isolation from the general body of Christians was to be regretted, and he was satisfied that if we knew more of them, and they of us, we should like each other all the better.

The Rev. S. F. Macdonald was disposed to take a hopeful view of the position and prospects of our body. A change, profound and extensive, was certainly going forward; Mr. Forster, Mr. Ham and Mr. Barling, were instances of recent conversion; but he thought this only shewed the general tendency. Definite views of religion he held to be of the greatest importance, and he valued the Unitarian faith for its noble, wise and merciful interpretation of the Divine government. He had always felt Orthodoxy to be *unnatural*, to be a strained, artificial thing, standing in opposition to the purer and better instincts of the human bosom; therefore he rejected it, and adopted a belief which does violence to no portion of man's nature. Our church required to simplify its principles, to familiarize them, and address them to the masses of society; when this was done, he felt satisfied we should be successful. Another thing that we wanted was due subordination. Perhaps we were too jealous of our freedom and the sacred sovereignty of the individual; we must not all expect to be officers in the great army, but be content to belong to the rank and file; "they also serve who only stand and wait;" nothing important can be accomplished without union. But above all, we wanted earnestness. It sometimes seemed as if we were afraid or ashamed of our belief. We were fond of quoting the sentiment that truth was great and must prevail; but ignorance and sin never die of themselves; they must be put to death; and truth can only prevail by the earnest efforts of the brave and the good.

The Rev. W. Selby's absence from the meeting on account of indisposition, was lamented by the Chairman.

J. W. Dowson, Esq., had no desire to conceal his Unitarian convictions, but he deemed those points of doctrine which separate us from other Christians as of far less importance than the conversion and salvation of souls. He thought we should unite as far as possible with other denominations in evangelizing the world, and seek to build up and extend our own churches by free communion and active co-operation between ministers and people. He deeply felt the value of such labourers as Mr. Martin in the cause of Christian truth and brotherly love, and hoped we might all learn to "go and do likewise."

Mr. James Freeman, to whom the Chairman alluded as representing a class of young men well fitted to enter the Christian ministry, said that he had attended this meeting with much pleasure and profit; he considered that ministers should not only be earnest in spirit, but also men of ability, learning and education, or they could not meet the spirit of scepticism now so prevalent in the world. He therefore wished best success to Manchester New College, and hoped it would train up a race of valuable men. He thought there was nothing in the Free Christian movement which was not to be found in Unitarianism, and believed, to use the words of an old divine, that "in essentials there should be unity, in non-essentials liberty, and in all things charity."

J. W. Dowson, Esq., begged to express his sense of the kindness and hospitality experienced by himself and others in past years from their Framlingham friends. The Chairman referred to the praiseworthy efforts of the ladies of our congregations, and wished that some of the gentlemen would follow their example. A vote of thanks was passed to Mr. Squire for his conduct in the chair; and after a fervent prayer by Mr. Martin, the meeting separated.

CALVINISM AND THE CONGREGATIONAL UNION.

To those who watch the religious signs of the times, it is sufficiently apparent that the Congregational body is in a transition state,—that the more learned and able of their ministers, and the more intelligent and cultivated congregations, are now in the practice of habitually ignoring the strict Calvinism in which their fathers believed. Their ministers are beginning to enjoy a much larger range and freedom of inquiry and thought. It is no longer in the power of any narrow-minded deacon to drive a too independent pastor from the pulpit, by expressing the suspicion of his want of soundness on one or more of the five points. Some of the more creed-bound Independents are unwilling to acknowledge the change going on; they shut their eyes against it, but they cannot stop it. At the recent meeting (the twenty-fourth annual assembly) of the Congregational Union held in London, some circumstances occurred which deserve attention. Owing to the absence of Dr. Halley, the chair was occupied by Rev. Dr. Brown, of Cheltenham, who scarcely upheld, either in intelligence or liberality, the standard of his denomination. So Mr. Binney probably thought, for, in seconding the vote of acknowledgment of the President's address, he made it his business, if not to correct his errors, at least to enlarge his view. To the Congregationalists, Dr. Brown assigned the glory of destroying the notorious "Socinianism and Infidelity of endowed churches, both Prelatical and Presbyterian." To them also he assigned the glory of having prepared the way for Wesley and Whitfield. But still less discreet was the line of remark adopted by Rev. S. McAll, of Nottingham, who is quite resolved that the Congregational body is and shall be to the end of time Calvinistic. But he shall speak for himself:

"On another point bearing on the ministry he must add a few words. What was the latitude to be admitted in reference to the doctrines held by the body? From that perfect toleration towards men of every faith, and even no faith, which, from the beginning, had been the distinction and glory of Independency, he would not have them swerve. Toleration Congregationalism had demanded in the worst of times, and had conceded it in the best. (Cheers.) As to their Communion, also—the fellowship of the Lord's Table, let them be as catholic as Catholicity itself—receiving all pious Romanists themselves, if they came, whom the Lord himself had received. (Cheers.) But as to the teaching of the body, that could not be too decided and uniform. They owed their present soundness, he believed, on the Trinitarian question, to the jealousy and determination with which their predecessors had opposed the least taint of that most subtle and most specious of all errors—Arianism. And now, in the presence of that assembly, he must proclaim the conviction, that the differences between Calvinistic and Arminian views of theology, were not matters on which the Congregational body were prepared to take, or could honourably take, neutral ground. (Hear, hear.) Their doctrinal standards—the Westminster Confession, the Declaration of the Savoy Conference, the Declaration put forth by that Union—were Calvinistic. (Hear, hear.) Every one of their colleges had been founded to teach a theology in its essence Calvinistic. Their Trust Deeds, under which they held all the property that was at their disposal, when they recognised doctrinal matters at all, were Calvinistic. (Hear, hear.) It was not, then, in a spirit of dictation, of inquisitorial narrowness, but of simple candour and honesty, he affirmed, that a Congregational church did not act a consistent part, if it asked a minister, with whatever excellencies he might be adorned, to preside over it that did not hold opinions which were substantially Calvinistic; and that a minister would only bring himself and others into a false position by accepting such a call. (Hear, hear.) Let not the extreme delicacy which the churches had in reference to whatever might infringe upon the liberty and independence of each other, be understood as implying that they were indifferent as to this question; and even at the risk of incurring some odium, he thought it but fair and candid to make the most explicit testimony respecting it."

The only voice of dissent that was

heard came from a layman, but one of some mark amongst the body. When speaking on the subject of the Ministers' Insurance Society, Edward Swaine, Esq., is reported to have said,—

"If everything Mr. McAll had said about doctrine was correct, he (Mr. Swaine) should not feel he was doing right in holding the office of Treasurer, inasmuch as he might have something to do with the distribution of the funds of the Society. If, in the case of a diligent minister of Christ, who had been the means of drawing sinners into the church, it should be suggested that he was, perhaps, not perfectly sound on Calvinism, he (Mr. Swaine) could not allow such an objection, nor give it the weight which some others possibly would attach to it. (Hear, hear.)"

The time we believe to be not very distant when a bolder protest than this will be uttered in the Congregational Union, against the assumption that that important denomination is to be for ever moored to the dogmas professed by their forefathers. Towards the close of the meeting, the noted Dr. Campbell, the editor of a newspaper and cheap magazine, which do little credit to the cause of Protestant Dissent or Christian learning, received from Rev. Geo. Conder, of Leeds, one of the ablest and most respectable ministers amongst the Independents, a gentle rebuke for his violation of the principles of Independency, by remarks of a dictatorial character respecting congregations when selecting ministers. The editor scarcely concealed his displeasure, and, while affecting to thank his brethren for their imagined praise, he gave them to understand he could, if necessary, smite as well as fawn. Elsewhere the expressions of opinion amongst Independents respecting their journals, as conducted by Dr. Campbell, have been far more open. In some lectures delivered at Manchester, a Mr. Porter, once colleague of the late Dr. Wardlaw, gave utterance to severe censure. We hope to live to see great changes in the religious world of England.

KIDDERMINSTER.

The Rev. M. Gibson's connection with the congregation in this town has now ceased. Soon after he sent in his resignation, a memorial was sent to him, with 141 signatures, expressing the feelings of sorrow and regret which the announcement of his intention had excited, and concluding that, "unwilling to terminate the connection which has so long and happily existed between us, we respectfully request you to reconsider your determination, and by precept and example to continue as hitherto to guide and encourage us in the paths of virtue and Christian holiness." It is now nearly thirteen years since he accepted the pastoral charge of the congregation.

SERVICES AT THE OLD PRESBYTERIAN CHAPEL, HALL BANK, BUXTON, 1854.

July 2. Rev. J. H. Hutton, B.A., Manchester.
— 9. Rev. E. C. Whitfield, Ilminster.
— 16. Rev. Wm. Whitelegge, M.A., Cork.
— 23. Rev. J. Lampray, Lincoln.
— 30. Rev. H. Green, M.A., Knutsford.
Aug. 6. Rev. James Whitehead, Ainsworth.
— 13. Rev. A. Lunn, Boston.
— 20. Rev. F. Baker, M.A., Bolton.
— 27. Rev. Wm. Smith, Rochdale.
Sept. 3. Rev. J. R. Montgomery, Huddersfield.
— 10. Rev. Chas. Beard, B.A., Gee Cross.
— 17. Rev. Joseph Hutton, LL.D., Derby.
— 24. Rev. R. L. Carpenter, B.A., Birkenhead.
Oct. 1. Rev. J. Cropper, M.A., Stand.

Morning service at eleven o'clock.
Evening service at half-past six.

SLAVERY AND THE BOSTON UNITARIAN ANNIVERSARIES.

We learn from the *Christian Inquirer* of New York, that at the banquet at Fanueil Hall which followed the meeting of the great annual Unitarian gathering, the following exciting incident occurred. Towards the close of the meeting, Mr. James H. Fowler, of the Divinity School at Cambridge, desired to say a few words, and was invited by the President to do so. He said he was aware that what this assembly expected was festivity and mirth. There are occasions when this is proper, and this is one of them. There is a time to laugh, and there is also a time to mourn. For himself, he must say, that under the circumstances that now attend our festival in this city, of a fellow-being arrested for no crime, and in danger of being carried into hopeless bondage, and with the feeling that pervades the

community in regard to it, he had been disappointed that no reference had been made to it, that none of the speakers had said anything for the sentiment of Liberty on this occasion and in this hall. There are times when the soul has feelings which cannot be uttered in speech, and that was his condition at the present time. He had gone away from this hall during the festivities, to go to the Anti-Slavery Convention, but an irresistible impulse had turned him back again, and he found himself here, and was compelled to speak. He said, we all know what is taking place in another hall. We know that divine person, whose name has been mentioned here, can never approve of this treatment to one of the least and humblest of his brethren. He could say, in the language of an apostle, that it was his desire and prayer to God that we might live peaceably with all men; but it was equally his prayer and heart's desire that the captive might go free. As he was about to enter the ministry of the Unitarian denomination, he wished to test the feelings of this assembly, to see whether he should go on in his purpose of becoming a minister in our body or not; for if there can be no expression of the sentiment of liberty and humanity among us, he thought he should go elsewhere. He offered the following sentiment: "The American Captive—whether in Massachusetts or South Carolina, or in any State, or on any soil over which the flag of our country waves, may his chains fall from his limbs, and may he be free, as Christ demands at our hands that he should be."

This voluntary speech and sentiment was received with several rounds of enthusiastic applause from the entire assembly, for which the young student of the Divinity School thanked them, regarding it as an expression that their feelings and sentiments were in unison with his own.

Wednesday.—The conference and prayer-meeting this morning was held in Freeman-Place chapel. It was attended by a very large congregation, and the subject of remark was mostly the case of the fugitive slave, Anthony Burns, confined in the court-house of Boston, guarded by United States' troops, and threatened to be carried into slavery for the crime of having a dark skin, on which account he had served his master many years without compensation, who claims that he shall do so the rest of his natural life, and submit to such labour, degradation and punishment, as he may choose to put upon him, or to be sold as a piece of property, if that should be his will. Remarks were made by several speakers touching his situation, and prayers offered for his deliverance.

On the subject of Slavery, the *Christian Inquirer* thus forcibly comments in a leading article, headed "The Boston Anniversaries:"

The anniversaries of last week were marked by distinguished literary and intellectual ability in some of the most prominent exercises; yet it was quite obvious that comparatively little of the public interest was given to them, so universal and so absorbing was the excitement from the case of the fugitive slave, Burns. We have never attended a more instructive and creditable meeting of the American Unitarian Association than that on Tuesday; yet the chosen words of the speakers and readers lacked the illumination kindled by general sympathy with the topic. Rev. J. F. Clarke's admirable address before the Ministerial Conference was heard by a select assembly instead of the usual crowd, and Rev. B. F. Frost's earnest and logical argument against slavery was heard by not many of the class usually most eager for such discussions. The collation, indeed, looked more like former years than any other assembly; yet even this pleasant social occasion partook of the general fever, and the only speaker who won any enthusiastic response was one whose speech turned wholly upon the doings at the court-house.

Our reporter has given a full sketch of the proceedings of our brethren at the various anniversaries, and we are content now to say a few words upon the tone of feeling, in Boston and the vicinity, upon the topic of slavery. It is clear that Garrison and his band of agitators have never, in their whole lifetime, made so many converts to anti-slavery as were made last week by the spectacle in Court Street. The Fugitive Slave Law was always strongly against the stomachs of the people of the Pilgrim City, and they tried to swallow it like any other unpalatable drugs, because they felt themselves bound to follow the prescription of their distinguished professional adviser. But the Nebraska Bill has shewn them that their great law doctor was deceived, and that the famous Compromise of 1850 is like Paddy's contract, in which the *reciprocity* was

all on one side. Very sober men, of highly conservative principles, talk very furiously upon the aggressions of the South upon the North, and the possibility and even the probability of disunion. We were not much impressed by the cheap rhetoric of the counsellors of mob violence. It was the deep conviction of the candid, common-sense people whom we met, which satisfied us that slave-catching is looked upon by the great majority as a foul dishonour to the Massachusetts soil, and that its days are already numbered. It seems clear to us that the slave-hunter in New England can be considered in no other light than as one of the most dangerous of incendiaries, and as such he should be kept away by the decency of the South and the manly indignation of the North. If the letter of the law gives a man a certain licence, it is no proof that he should use the licence. A man has a legal right to take the last dollar from the orphan, or refuse bread to the starving, yet no decent man will use the right. Quite as little will any decent man use the legal right to repeat the horrors of last week in Boston, to inflame the honest indignation of the great majority against oppression, and seize hold of a poor fugitive from slavery with such desperate aid as a band of hireling marines and a gang of ruffians who are the vomit of brothels and gambling-hells. We do not believe in mob law, and therefore it is that we condemn the incendiarism that of necessity provokes the passion for liberty into the spirit of rebellion.

OBITUARY.

Mr. Henry Harrison, the subject of the present brief memoir, was born on the 30th of April, 1813. He was the second son of the Rev. William Harrison and Maria Kelsal. His grandfather, the Rev. Ralph Harrison, formerly preached at the Dissenting chapel, Cross Street, Manchester, in combination with Dr. Barnes, who was a popular preacher in his day. His father conducted public worship at a small Dissenting chapel at Blackley, near Manchester, which had formerly been under the care of the Rev. J. Pope, a man of considerable learning.

Mr. Harrison's early life was characterized by the liveliness of his disposition and the quickness of his intellect. When yet very young, he displayed considerable powers of memory which, united with a readiness of perception, gave promise of unusual ability. It is not always easy to say what credit is to be given to the stories which are related of precocity of intellect; it is, at least, safer to rest in general assertions than trust implicitly to particular instances. There can be no doubt, however, that great differences are to be discovered even in the natural aptitude of the youngest children.

Mr. Harrison was first educated by his father, who, like many others of his profession, united the business of a schoolmaster to his ministerial avocations. The emolument which arises from a small Dissenting chapel is generally too insignificant in itself to provide for those who are not already possessed of an independent property. Subsequently, Mr. Harrison was placed with Mr. Dixon, a respectable tutor, who still conducts a commercial academy in the neighbourhood of Manchester. At a later period, Mr. Harrison was instructed by the Rev. Dr. Beard, who had recently returned from the Unitarian College, then existing at York.

It is to be lamented that the instruction which is imparted in the majority of schools is too restricted to afford even the rudiments of a liberal education; it being commonly thought sufficient to teach the elements of the Latin language, in addition to the principles of English grammar and the ordinary rules of arithmetic. Dr. Beard, however, endeavoured to include in his instructions a more extended course of education, particularly wishing to excite in his pupils a taste for literature, and to encourage the practice of English composition. Mr. Harrison, even at this early period, evinced a remarkable facility of writing, and the poetical contributions which he began to send to the Manchester newspapers and the Christian Teacher (a journal then conducted by Dr. Beard), display a nice appreciation of the delicacies of this department of letters. Unfortunately, these fragments of poetry are too widely scattered to be easily brought together; nor did Mr. Harrison seem to attach any value to them, so soon as the occasion which prompted them had ceased to interest him. They embraced various subjects and styles of composition, some being translations from the Greek and Italian authors, and others original compositions or imitations of our classical writers. They were, for the most part, simply signed with the initials, H. H.

But Mr. Harrison did not merely dis-

tinguish himself in compositions of this nature; he shewed himself possessed of that versatility of mind which finds comparative ease in most mental exercises, and to which a powerful memory no doubt largely contributes. In the study of language he made large proficiency, reading the Greek and Latin Classics with a degree of facility which is seldom acquired. He also possessed a competent knowledge of French and Italian literature. At the completion of his educational pursuits, Mr. Harrison was apprenticed to Mr. Atkinson, a solicitor in Manchester, with whom he passed creditably through the usual period of apprenticeship.

In 1836, he went to London to be admitted as a solicitor, but returned immediately to his native town, where he commenced the practice of his profession.

The talent which Mr. Harrison possessed was united to a vivacious disposition and a confidence in his own ability which led him to underrate the importance of assiduity and energy. Either he neglected the advantages which his position presented, or did not sufficiently rouse himself to overcome its difficulties.

In 1837, he left hurriedly for Dublin, without any sufficient motive, and without the knowledge of his friends. Here he maintained himself in a state of obscurity unworthy of his talents, apparently devoid of that ambition which is so necessary to stimulate industry. He was at length induced to return to Manchester; but being still unsettled, he eventually sailed to New York in 1844, and from this city he never returned.

He died on the 16th of December, 1853.

It must be admitted that ambition has a large share in stimulating the industry of the most devoted student. That which is supposed to be done for the love of letters is, in reality, often dictated by a love of approbation. The solitary lamp is seldom burned purely for the pleasure derivable from the exercise of the mind, and continued mental occupation is at least as often toilsome as pleasing. It is the expectation of distinction which supports the literary labourer, and if this harvest were not expected, it is easy to conceive that his studies would soon be suspended. If Mr. Harrison had possessed a larger share of ambition, he would have done more for himself and more for mankind; and in seeking honourable distinction, he would have exchanged obscurity for honour and affluence.

The following specimens of Mr. Harrison's poetry are selected chiefly because it is conceived that the subjects will be in accordance with the character of this journal, and are by no means to be considered his best productions. The first is from a volume of Hymns compiled by the Rev. Dr. Beard.

CONTINUAL PRAISE TO GOD.

We bless thee, Lord—the matin skies
Shall see our altar's incense rise;
The fragrance of the morning air
Shall mingle with the breath of prayer.

And the first sound o'er earth and sea
Shall be the hymn of praise to thee!
We bless thee, Lord!—the mid-day sun
Our orisons shall look upon.

Amid the world's contending tide
Our willing hearts shall turn aside
To worship thee—as He hath taught
Who ofttimes such communion sought.

We bless thee, Lord!—the sunset dyes
Shall gild our evening sacrifice;
And night shall only close us o'er,
That we may bless thy goodness more.

So shall each day successive be
One long continued thought of thee;
The light of peace around us shed,
And heaven begun ere life is fled!

LIGHT OF NATURE.

"It is a happy world after all—the air, the earth, the water, teem with delighted existence."—*Paley's Nat. Theol.*

I looked on the morn, on the balmy morn,
When the sunbeams danced on the waving corn,
And the East was tinged with a golden hue,
And the meadows glittered with pearls of dew,
And the birds that peopled each shrub and tree
Were warbling their tuneful melody;
And I said, Can it be that the Author of these
Is a God of vengeance that none can appease?
Oh, thinkest thou not they were given to prove
His infinite mercy and endless love?

'Twas noon—and the freshness of morn was gone,
Yet strong and brilliant the sunbeams shone,
And a flood of glory around them streamed,
And the air with delightful fragrance teemed;
All cloudless and pure was the azure sky,
And nature was vocal with strains of joy:
I said, Can it be that the Author of these
Is a God of vengeance that none can appease?
Are they not blessings designed to prove
A *Father's* mercy, a *Father's* love?

'Twas night—and I looked on the spangled sky,
And the thousands of worlds that were rolling by;
The moonbeams slept on the silver deep,
And the hum of voices was hushed in sleep;
Not a sound was heard, save the night-wind's sigh,
That whispered of peace and harmony;
And I said, Can it be that the Author of these
Is a God of vengeance that none can appease?

J. B. H.

April, 27, at Frenchay, Anna Serena Howse, aged 15. In childhood she possessed all the graces which adorn that happy period of life. Remarkable for generosity of disposition and strict veracity, she not only defended the right with unflinching moral courage, but never silently acquiesced in what appeared to her contrary to the principles of truth and justice. Symptoms of weakness which at times caused anxiety in the minds of her parents, disappeared as her years increased, and her vigorous intellectual and moral powers gave them reason to hope for the developement of a useful and earnest character. Their well-founded hopes were fulfilled, but not in the manner that they had fondly anticipated. In the autumn of 1849, her weakness returned and considerably increased, confining her for many hours in the day; and for eighteen months previous to her death, with rare exception, wholly to her couch. When the nature of the spinal disease from which she suffered was explained to her, the flesh warred against the spirit, and for a short time she felt that her trial was heavier than she could bear. But her earnest prayer for faith and patience was answered, and she cheerfully resigned herself to the prospect of many years' suffering and privation, occupying herself in such employments as could be pursued in a reclining posture, enjoying the study of botany, and still more that of the Scriptures and religious works. Clearer and brighter each succeeding day did her faith and trust become. She saw "God in everything, and everything in God;" and when the time approached that it was needful to inform her of her approaching dissolution, she simply said that it had long been her conviction that she should soon pass to her eternal home, and she should die quite happy if she could have her mother's assurance that she would not be "very sorry" when she was gone. She talked freely of the great change that awaited her to a dear sister and other tender relatives, who ministered to her comfort, and who learned lessons of wisdom, of invaluable price, by the bed-side of that humble, patient and devoted sufferer. Her interest in others triumphed over severe bodily pain. She was desirous that an orthodox friend should know that she died a Unitarian, "not trusting in her own works, but in the love of God,—that love which gave Jesus to us." It was this faith in her Heavenly Father's love which gave and which diffused around her such sweet peace. The dark valley of death was illumined to her, upheld as she was by Him who had entered it before her, and she left behind her a beam of light, which brightens the sorrow of her bereaved parents. Her

"memory breathes
A sweetness that survives her living days."

She was interred, May 6th, by the Rev. H. Hawkes, in the cemetery in Lyncombe Vale, which had been given by her grandfather to the Unitarian congregation at Bath.

May 29, at Chichester, aged 22, Emma, eldest daughter of Mr. Henry Ide. Though the "short and simple annals of the poor," and of persons in a humble station, may not often afford incidents of sufficient importance to be worthy of obituary notice, there are there at times some flowers whose fragrance should not be suffered to "be lost in desert air." This remark, stripped of its figure, applies to the interesting young person mentioned above, whom a lingering consumption at length removed from her family and friends. Her religious views were decidedly Unitarian; and she would modestly, but firmly, give to those who lamented that such was the case, "a reason for the hope that was in her." These views beneficially influenced her in life; they nobly supported her in the expectation of death. In consequence of the loss of her mother about three years since, the management of her father's household devolved on her; but though family duties were many, they were seldom allowed to keep her from the house of God, and she was particularly anxious to attend with regularity at the table of her Lord. When her symptoms became rather alarming, she said to her minister, who frequently visited her, "I should like to take the Lord's Supper with you *once more before I die*, to record again my belief in him; and I should like to do this soon, lest my head become weak and confused, so as to

prevent my fully enjoying it." Such was the enviable state of her mind; her soul was prepared for heaven. On the Sunday evening following her interment, the Rev. J. Fullagar, taking 1 Thess. ii. 19 as his text, after a few usual remarks on the vanity of life, dwelt forcibly on the proof afforded by such a death-bed scene as had in this case been witnessed, of the too much overlooked importance of the Christian ministry, the object of which appointment being clearly the salvation of souls; for that while the death of a young person was always a subject of deep interest to all, it was particularly so to an affectionate, conscientious minister, if he could venture to hope that his pulpit exhortations and his private conversation had been concurring means in preparing such a soul for heaven. When taking a final farewell, so far as earth is concerned, of his departing friend, he may in such a case almost apply to his mission the words which the Lord himself applied to his, "It is finished;" for where no reasonable doubt can be entertained that a soul is saved, being fully prepared for heaven, the *object of his mission is accomplished*. And while, alas! from the irregular attendance of many in the house of prayer—from the general unconcern to religious improvement visible in many who even attend there—he feels with deep sorrow and mortification that he cannot look forward with perfect confidence to their final approval by their Judge, this sorrow finds some alleviation; and the deep gloom of the chamber of sickness, in which consumption is daily making encroachments, is brightened when he feels that he may say to the languid and almost pulseless sufferer, "What is our hope and joy and crown of rejoicing? Art not thou at the presence of the Lord Jesus Christ, at his coming? for thou art my glory and my joy." Yes, indeed,

"Sweet is the scene when virtue dies,
When sinks a righteous soul to rest."

June 19, at Ilminster, Mr. GILES LANG, at the age of 70 years. He was a man of activity, enterprizing in business, a kind and useful neighbour, and faithful to many trusts that were confided to him, so that he has left remembrances of himself in the minds of his fellow-townsmen which will not be readily effaced. In early life Mr. Lang joined the congregation of the Old Meeting in that town, and ever after firmly maintained the great principles of the Unitarian faith. They were his comfort and hope as life declined and closed in death.

June 29, at Stadley Park, Shropshire, in the 44th year of his age, Mr. WILLIAM YATES, late of Manchester.

MARRIAGES.

Feb. 27, at the Unitarian church, Stockport, by Charles Hudson, Esq., Mr. ROGER MARSDEN to Miss MARY HOUGH.

May 3, in the chapel of the First Presbyterian congregation, Belfast, by the father of the bride, LUCIUS OCTAVIUS, third son of Thomas HUTTON, Esq., of Elm Park, Dublin, to MARGARET, eldest daughter of Rev. Wm. BRUCE, of Belfast.

May 24, at the Unitarian church, Stockport, by Rev. James Bayley, Mr. JAMES GASKELL to Miss RUTH LEES.

May 31, at Mill-Hill chapel, Leeds, by Rev. Chas. Wicksteed, J. M. GREENHOW, Esq., of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, to ANNE, second daughter of the late Wm. LUPTON, Esq., of Leeds.

June 12, at the Unitarian church, Stockport, by Rev. James Bayley, Mr. WILLIAM PERCIVEL to Miss SUSANNAH WALKER.

June 17, at the Old meeting, Coseley, Staffordshire, by Rev. Joseph Fedes Fletcher, JOHN WHITEHOUSE, Esq., solicitor, to LYDIA, elder daughter of Mr. James MATTHEWS, of the Sedgley Road, Tipton.

June 17, in the First Presbyterian meeting-house, Belfast, by Rev. Jas. Malcolm, of Chester, A. G. MALCOLM, Esq., M.D., Belfast, to MARIA GLENNY, only daughter of William HORNE, Esq., late of the 86th Regiment.

June 20, at the High-Pavement chapel, Nottingham, by Rev. Dr. Hutton, of Derby, HENRY HUTTON, Esq., of Dublin, to Miss SWANWICK, of Lenton Field.

June 20, at the Unitarian Baptist chapel, Horsham, Mr. HENRY AGATE, to HARRIETT, eldest daughter of Rev. R. ASHDOWNE.

June 28, at the Octagon chapel, Norwich, by Rev. Samuel Martin, of Trowbridge, Mr. JAMES JOSEPH CAMPLING, of Norwich, iron-founder, to ELIZA JANE, second daughter of the late Mr. William Anthony BURRAGE, of the same place, schoolmaster.

July 13, at the Registrar's office, St. Pancras, Mr. STEPHEN C. FREEMAN to Miss ELIZABETH D. HAYWARD, both of Kentish Town.